

AN  
APPENDIX  
TO THE  
THIRD PART  
OF THE  
Friendly Debate,  
BEING A  
LETTER  
OF THE  
CONFORMIST  
TO THE  
NON-CONFORMIST:  
Together with a  
POSTSCRIPT.

---

By the same Author.

---

LONDON,  
Printed for *H. Eversden*, under the Crown  
in *West Smithfield*. 1670.

APPENDIX

THE D. D. D.

THE D. D. D.

THE D. D. D.

THE D. D. D.

THE D. D. D.

THE D. D. D.

THE D. D. D.

THE D. D. D.

n  
f  
f  
I  
f  
t  
h  
F  
m  
b  
d  
fu



---

## The P R E F A C E.

**I**F I was not swayed  
more by the love  
of Truth, than of  
my own Credit, I should,  
for many reasons, have  
suppressed this following  
Letter. Which discovers  
so many gross falshoods in  
the reflections which  
have been made on the  
Friendly Debate, that,  
whatsoever Censures may  
be passed on me, the Rea-  
der may receive some pro-  
fit from it. Which that I

A 2 might

## The Preface.

might not hinder by putting too big a Book into his hands, I have cast away a great deal of what I had writ about other untruths and absurd reasonings: hoping that this will be sufficient to make those that peruse it wary and observant; and then they may detect the rest themselves without my assistance. And truly the greatest difficulty I met withal in this work, was to resolve what things I should single out as Instances of the impertinencies, falsifyings, and

## The Preface.

and misunderstandings, &c.  
of my *New Adversary*.  
Which proved, I confess, a  
business so tedious, in such  
a great number as lay be-  
fore me; that to ease my  
self of too great a labour,  
I was constrained at last to  
take them just as they came  
next to my thoughts. If it  
chance by this means that  
I have left any thing un-  
touched, which some desi-  
red most of all should have  
been handled, there is no  
remedy: And it is better  
that they should want com-  
pleat satisfaction, than that

## The Preface.

all should be tired with the length of my Discourse. Besides, I find that I myself have suffered by it; for I have passed by sundry reflections wherein my private person was more particularly concerned; which came not to mind till my Letter, I thought, was swell'd to too large a Bulk. This is some sign that I am not so melancholy as my Adversary muses (for such men use to be more resentive than to forget the injuries that are done them) and that I have no list to write

## The Preface.

write a Book merely to clear myself from false imputations. And indeed I found other matter to make this Treatise larger than I intended: which was a Case that came to my hand after I had considered the Apology. Whatsoever belonged to me in those Sheets, I have also spent a few thoughts upon: But took not my self to be concerned in his bold challenge to answer a Book, which I have not the least knowledge of, and which another person, he

## The Preface.

tells me, is more particularly bound ( I am sure is better able) to reply unto, if he think it worthy his pains. I cannot tell neither whether that person be ingaged in honour to accept the challenge; no, though he proclaim him a Coward, if he do not: For to answer some men ( as one well speaks ) is but to comment upon their Gibberish for those that understand it not, and thereby to bring their folly into more credit and request. I apply not this to that Book, which,  
as

## The Preface.

as I said, I am perfectly ignorant of; and may deserve consideration: But to such vainglorious Challenges as I have seen from mere Barbarians and Savages, who imagine roaring and being furious is far more noble than speaking and reasoning. Mr. Vavasor Powel I remember made a challenge\* to any Minister or Scholar of ours to dispute Publickly, or Privately on this Question (and another) Whether our mixed way, or their way of Separation was nearest

\* June 11.  
1651.

## **The Preface.**

nearest to the Word of God? But it was drawn up in such rude and Kitchen Latine as never, I think, saw the light since the Goths sack'd Rome; and as evidently demonstrated that he thought his sufficiency to be greater than it was, and that men take themselves sometimes to be true owners of things, of which they are but mere Usurpers.

As for the Ecclesiastical Policy (which he also carps at) a work of equal strength and beauty;  
it



## The Preface.

it hath an Author who needs no assistant to defend it against the ablest Champion they can bring into the Field. Time will shew the truth of this; and therefore I shall say no more of it, lest those commendations which that Author hath in kindness bestowed on my poor endeavours, should look in the eyes of our Enemies, like bartering with praises for the return of others.

I have but one thing more to add, which was  
omitted

## **The Preface.**

*omitted in its proper place,  
but fit to have been in-  
serted, Page 118. of the  
following Book. There  
you will find Mr. Baily  
affirms, That both Hou-  
ses abjured Episcopacy  
( whatsoever some pre-  
tended to the contrary )  
by the Oath and Cove-  
nant ; which may be con-  
firmed, I must add, by  
their Declaration of the  
Fifth of August, 1645.  
sent to the Lords States  
General of the United  
Provinces ; who by their  
Embassadours had, among  
other*

## The Preface.

other things, propounded and offered from the King the calling of a National Synod to correct and redress the Government of the Church by Bishops. One of the Answers there given, why they could not admit of that Mediation, was, That not only the Kingdom of Scotland, and the Members of both Houses of Parliament, but also many thousands of others of his Majesties Subjects of England and Ireland stand bound

## The Preface.

bound by their late National Covenant to endeavour the extirpation of the Church Government by Bishops in *England and Ireland*, and to hinder the setting of it up again in the Kingdom of *Scotland*. *This passage I find the Commissioners of Scotland remember the Houses of, both in their Papers of the 20. and 24. of October, 1646. about the disposing of the Kings Person; and in their Answer upon the new Propo-*

## The Preface.

Propositions of Peace,  
and the Four Bills, signed  
17. December, 1647.  
which I thought good here  
to mention, as a further  
confutation of the Apolo-  
gist; whose pretenses I now  
leave you to consider.

---

---

*ERRATA.*

**P**Age 44. line 18. read *they presented.*  
p. 45. l. 5. r. *falsifies.* p. 59. l. 9. for of r.  
*over.* p. 77. l. 7. r. *leaning.* p. 80. l. 9. r. of it.  
p. 87. l. ult. for *his Petition,* r. *suspicion.* p. 100.  
l. 12. r. *in Ireland.* p. 115. l. 13. r. *Land. But.*  
p. 145. l. 10. for *setling* r. *selling.* p. 151. l. 15.  
dele *same.* p. 154. l. 22. r. *charge King Ed-*  
*ward 6.*

---

AN  
APPENDIX  
TO THE  
THIRD PART,  
OF THE  
Friendly Debate.

SIR,



I Have received the Book  
you sent me [ *An humble  
Apology for Non Confor-  
mists, with modest and seri-  
ous reflections on the Friend-  
ly Debate* ] and wish it had come to  
my hands before as it came after the  
last Term, that so it might have been  
considered by us when we discoursed  
together about *Philagathus*. This Apo-  
logist or Catechist ( I know not which  
to call him ) should indeed have  
been otherwise treated, because he is

B

of

2 *An Appendix to the Third Part*

of another strain: And though he commits the very same faults, yet not with the same confidence and braving that *Philagathus* did; whose over-daring carried him in a ridiculous manner *to catch a Tartar*; that is, in plain English, to lose himself.

- I. You cannot but observe sure with what a grave and serious impertinence this *N. C. Catechism* begins: Alledging these words (wherewith Bishop *Bramhal* concludes his *Vindication of the Church of England*) for a reason why an Answer was not given sooner to my Book; viz. *We little imagine with what difficulties poor Exiles struggle, whose minds are more intent on what they should eat to morrow than what they should write.* It was very unadvisedly done, methinks, to put us in mind at the very first dash how cruelly they used such excellent persons in time past, who, as the Bishop there feelingly complains in the words immediately following, *were chased as Vagabonds into the merciless world to beg relief of strangers*



*strangers* (a.) He shews himself also a very careless Writer, who in the very entrance of his Work confesses that extreme rigour and severity against the men of the Church of *England*, which afterwards he denies ; telling us, *That scarce any man in those days, who was able sober and peaceable, but might, if he had pleased, have employment and a livelihood* (b.) But to use the Bishop as their *Advocate in this case* (as he speaks) that is to make his heavy complaint a reason for their silence, is such an absurdity as none could be guilty of but one whose wit is turn'd *Vagabond*, and gone a wool-gathering. For suppose he be an Exile (which I do not believe) are the rest of the Non-Conformists, and they who are best able to write a Book either banished into a strange Land, or exposed to those hardships which the Bishop there sighs under ? One would think rather that this *Apologist* (for his part) is in so good plight that he hath time to be idle and trifle ; or that he hath not yet lost that niceness and delicacy which I

a See pag.  
279 and  
his Pasthe-  
tick Ad-  
dress to  
*England*;  
p. 277.

b Humble  
Apol. p. 23;  
& 151.

noted in this sort of men, who complain of every little restraint as if it were the hugest oppression. They are *Exiles*, forsooth, because some of them may not live within five miles of their former Dwelling: They are banished, because they are confined to a Country Town, and may not dwell in a Corporation. I can make no other meaning of his application of those words to themselves; Unless you will have it, that he had a mind to sport a little as *Luther* sometimes did; who was wont to call the place of his retirement, when the *Pope* thundred against him, by the name of *his Patmos* (c) though it was a good Castle where he lay obscured from his Enemies, was well entertained by his Friends, had the liberty sometimes to gather Strawberries, or to go a Hunting in the neighbouring places; and which is best of all, had there the happy leisure to translate the New Testament into the German Tongue. And so indeed this Writer tells us (p. 47.) that the *Non-Conformists* are turned out

c Melch.  
Adam ps.  
221. &c.

*of the Friendly Debate.*

*to grafs,* and for that cause, the *Cir-  
cingle* will not become them. By which  
merriment you may see the *Animal* is  
in good case, and that you are like to  
find wonderfully *serious* reflections on  
the Friendly Debate. But let it be as  
he supposes, that they are *poor Exiles*,  
and that the Pasture into which they  
are turn'd out, is but short; yet I  
hope they are not such *Evil Beasts*,  
*slow bellies* (d) as the *Cretians* were, <sup>d Tit. 1.</sup>  
that is (as some understand their Cha- <sup>12.</sup>  
racter) such great feeders, but that  
they might have chopt a little Logick  
with me without pinching their guts,  
and given an Answer to a Book that  
hath so little reason in it, if he may be  
believed, without indangering the de-  
frauding of their stomachs. The great  
work of eating might have gone on,  
and this not have been neglected. For  
it would not have cost much more  
time to *confute*, than it did to *read* a  
Book, in which, as he tells you (e) <sup>en face,</sup>  
*the words are more than the matter,* the <sup>p. 5.</sup>  
*Rhetorick far beyond the Logick,* and  
which hath smitten them not so much

with the *Fist*, as with the *Palms of the hands*. I should think it would cost him a great deal more to reconcile these words with those that follow in the end of his Preface, *That I have made so many hard and desperate thrusts at them* (which it is not easie to do with the *Palm of ones hand*) *that it hath forced them at last to draw in their defence*.

O, may some say, but to what purpose had it been to draw sooner? *Besides*, that they are Exiles, *If an Answer had stoln forth without Licence, would it not have been arrested for a seeming breach of a late Act about Printing? &c.* This is another solemn piece of impertinence (to say no worse) wherewith he closes his Answer to the first Question of his Catechism, why a Reply came out no sooner. May not I better ask, With what Authority this comes out now? Was there a greater Priviledge for unlicenced Books this last *Michaelmas*, than there was in *Hilary* or *Easter* Term before? This very Apology confutes it self; and lets

## of the Friendly Debate.

7

lets you see how little you are to expect from this Undertaker who stumbles in such a lubberly manner at his first setting out. For as that Bishop, now mentioned, speaks in another case, *It were strange if he should throw a good cast, who soales his bowle upon an under-song* (f.)

[Reply to  
S. H's Re-  
futation,  
p. 1.

If he had not wanted substantial matter to alledge in excuse of their faults, he would not have said, I perswade my self, into so many of the Vices of *Philagathus* (whose *sober Answer* stands but for a Cypher in this Mans account) being a little more modest. He wants not his, *It may bee's*, (g) *it is possible, for ought I know*, and such like words which signifie nothing, but that he knew not what to say, and yet was big with an Apology. This barrenness of weighty matter, made him serve us up the same insipid Coleworts twice or thrice over. He begins his Preface and his Book too (h) with the same complaint, that *I have smitten them on the right cheek, and on*

II.

g. Pag 6.  
273) 4, &c.

h. See Ant.  
10 Quest. 1.

l Pag. 42,  
89, 131.

k Pag. 99.

l Pag. 38,

41, 61, 64,

65, 68, 74,

89, 103,

104.

*the left.* And *Bonnors* Beef and broth he sets before us three times at least (i.) He is for Cookery too, Sauces, and garnishing of dishes (k). And tells vagrant stories very prodigally (l) out of their unwritten traditions, from whence they furnished so many brazen Legends in the beginning of the late Tumults: *News from Hell, News from Rome, News from Court, News from Ipswich, Cathedral news from Canterbury,* and many more. All which I shall pass by at this present, because they are *Peccadillo's* in compare with the other faults that he hath committed.

- III. He makes no bones for instance, as modest and humble as he seems, to talk of several things which he doth not understand, nor hath examined at all. The very Second Page of his Book gives you a proof of it; where he tells you, *He humbly conceives that every transgression of an humane Law, though but Penal, is not so culpable or criminal, as is pretended.* Truly, I conceive so too, that all Offences are not

not of equal guilt ; but I must let him know, that as I did not pretend *every transgression* of a Law to be so culpable as the transgression of that I spoke of, so, I humbly conceive, he pretends to skill in the nature of *Laws but Penal*, which he is utterly ignorant of. For both that Law which I mentioned, and all those that he instances in, are more than Penal, as is manifest to every one that hath made the least search into these matters. A Law that is *but Penal*, as every ordinary Casuist might have taught him \*, *commands nothing* ; but only exacts a Penalty in case a man think fit to do, or not to do some things therein expressed : As if a man be chosen Alderman of the City of *London*, and refuse to hold the Place, he is by a Law among them to pay a Fine to *them*. Which is called a Law but Penal, because it doth not require or bind a man to serve this Office ( he is at liberty whether he will or no ) it requires only the payment of such a Sum of Money if he think good not to serve. So that here indeed

\* Instead of all, let him consult Dr. Sanderson de oblig. conscientia Pral. 8<sup>a</sup>.

to

to pay the Money doth ordinarily satisfie the Law ; because a Law-maker binds us only by declaring his will to Oblige us, and he declares nothing as his will to oblige a man in this case, but the payment of a Fine. Which is called a *Penalty* in a large sense, as it is something which a man would not willingly undergo if it were left to his own choise, and is imposed on him in stead of another burden which he refuses, viz. that of Government. But what is this to the Law which I had occasion to mention ? Which is not of this sort, but a *Law Mandatory*, as I may call it ; requiring them not to inhabite in such and such places. Upon which account it is a *Moral Law*, to regulate mens manners ; and for that cause, it is a vertue to obey it, and a vice to disobey it. Nor doth the addition of a *Penalty* to it alter its nature. For such Laws are a Rule of life given with an intention to oblige men to obedience ; there being few that know of themselves what is best and most profitable for common life : And the



the Penalty is not to be undergone in  
stead of the obedience, but is added  
to contain Subjects in their duty by  
the fear of it, because even they  
who may know what is best will not  
otherwise do it. So that in conclusion;  
such a Law with a Penalty layes a dou-  
ble obligation upon us both *ad pœnam*  
and *ad culpam* as they speak, to suffer  
the punishment, and to be sinners if  
we disobey it. There is no doubt of  
the former, and it is as unreasonable  
to question the latter; because the  
Law contains a Command, and Sin is  
nothing but the transgression of a  
Command: which transgression is  
greater or less according as the will of  
the Law-maker is more or less to ob-  
lige us; and that is to be known very  
much by the greatness or smallness of  
the Penalty whereby it is enacted to  
move us to obedience. This he might  
have learnt of Bishop *Taylor*, whom he  
quotes directly against his meaning.  
For that Question which this man re-  
solves Affirmatively [*Is it not enough*  
*to satisfy the Law to pay the Mulect or*  
*Penalty*

*Penalty in such Cases?* p. 3.] he answers Negatively: And that within a few lines of that very place which this Apologist alledges to a quite contrary sense. You may find it in his *Holy Living*, Chap. 3. Sect. 1. Rule 7. which begins thus, *Do not believe thou hast kept the Law when thou hast suffered the punishment, &c.* Read the rest at your leisure; and do not believe this man who abuses the Bishop, and wrests his words (as their manner is) from their meaning: The Rule that he mentions being directed to another purpose, and expressed in terms flatly against him. *As long*, saith the Bishop, *as the Law is obligatory, so long our obedience is due*, (m) &c. If obedience be due, then I hope it is not sufficient to suffer the Penalty; and then this Writer shamefully perverts the sense of that Rule, or else doth not understand it; which is no more but this, that a fixed Custome abrogates a Law, and makes our obedience no longer due to it. While the Law is in force, we sin if we do not obey it; but a fixed

m 1b. Ru'e  
the 4. quo-  
ted by this  
Apol. p. 4.

fixed Custom makes it not to be in force, and then we are free from it. This is the sense of the Bishop; to which nothing need be added, but that whilst the Law-giver constantly declares his will that it should oblige, no Custom can be pleaded, nor excuse be made for doing contrary to it.

But you think perhaps that he may find some relief in Mr. *Perkins* whom he also alledges. You may try if you please, but if you consult the place, you will see he had some reason not to tell you where to find it. For first he recites his words imperfectly, and doth not let you know that Mr. *Perkins* declares, where the Law-maker intends obedience simply the Statutes are necessary to be kept. And again, that he doth not excuse men from all blame who break some of the *lesser local Statutes*, but only saith, *Students may in some sort excuse themselves from the sin of Perjury, though not from all faults, in breaking some of the lesser local Statutes.* They are his very words  
in

in his Second Book of Cases of Conscience, *Chap.* 13. in the latter end. But to pass by this: That part of his words which he cites, are so far from reaching his purpose, that they are against him. For first, the Law-maker intends obedience simply to the Laws that they break, as is manifest to all. For secondly, they are not Laws meerly for Decency and Order ( which *Mr. Perkins* speaks of ) but for the preservation of the being of Christian Society, which is destroyed by separation and division. And therefore thirdly, the Penalty is not as beneficial to the state of the Society as actual Obedience;

As for that which follows in the end of his Answer to this Question (which herepeats again, *p.* 128. ) it is altogether impertinent. For we do not charge them with a bare omission of what our Governours command, but with a direct opposition to it, and that to the great scandal of the People, and contempt of the Royal Authority. All which things considered, I think in stead  
of

of making an Apology for the Non-Conformists, he had better have followed the counsel of *Alcibiades* to his Uncle when he found him busie about his Accounts; which was, that he should study rather how to give no account at all.

For he is grossly ignorant in other Learning as well as in this; as appears by his discourse about *Ordination by Presbyters*, which follows a little after. The *Friendly Debate* gave him no occasion to mention any thing of this nature, but he had a mind it seems to give us a taste of his skill in this great Question; though it be so small that I know not how to excuse his boldness in meddling with it. He supposes that the *Chorepiscopi* (which he makes the same with our *Rural Deans*) may lawfully Ordain. And next, that *Suffragans* were but such Presbyters; so that he who was Ordained by them had not Episcopal Ordination. And then thirdly, He would have you believe that Archbishop *Usher* and other Learned

IV.

Learned

Learned men concurring in judgment with him, were of this opinion. Every one of which propositions are notoriously false, as I will plainly shew you by demonstrating these three things. 1. That those called *Chorepiscopi*, Rural or Country Bishops never had the Power of Ordination, being not of the Order of Bishops, but Presbyters something advanced above the rest. 2. On the other side, that *Suffragans* had the power of Ordination, being not meer Presbyters, but Bishops, as those in the City were. And lastly, That the late Primate saith nothing contrary to this.

as About  
the year  
314.

For the first: The *Country Bishops*, saith the Council of *Neocæsarea*, (n) *Can. 13.* were but of such a degree as the seventy Disciples, and appointed after their Type: to whom the Antients, every body knows, make Presbyters to be the Successors, as Bishops are to the Apostles. And therefore that Council calls them only *Assistants* to the Bishops, in that part of their Diocess which was distant from

from the City. But that they had only a part of the Episcopal Power committed to them, not the whole, we learn from the Council of *Ancyra* presently after, *Can. 13.* which decreed that the *Chorepiscopi, or Country Bishops* ought not to ordain either *Ppesbyters* or *Deacons*. (o) To which purpose he that pleases may find many authorities in *Justellus* his notes upon that place. And in the Council of *Antioch*, *Can. 10.* the same is decreed again, that they should know their bounds or measures, and appoint *Readers, Sub-Deacons, and Catechists*, but not dare to proceed further, nor to make a *Priest* or *Deacon*, without the Bishop of the City to which both he and his Region were subject. The same Canons were in the Roman Church, as appears by the Body of the Decrees: (p) The words of which being abbreviated by *Sigebert* he calls them *Arch-Deacons*. But afterward the Council of *Laodicea* decreed, *Can. 37.* that this sort of Officers should be abolished, and no Bishops should be

ο Χορηγ-  
οις μὴ  
ἐν τῇ  
ἐκκλησίᾳ  
τοῦ ὁ  
κατὰ τὴν  
ἐκκλησίαν.

p. v. p. 11.  
Distinct.  
63: c. q.

C appointed

appointed *in aliquibus & in multis* in the Villages, and in the Countries: and that they who had been already constituted should do nothing without the consent of the Bishop of the City. But instead of them there should be [*mensural*] *Visitors*, that should go about to find out what was amiss, and correct mens manners. In like manner we find in the Body of the Canon Law (g) a Decree of Pope *Damasus* to this purpose, That *the Chorepiscopi have been prohibited as well by that See, as by the Bishops of the whole world.* One reason of which prohibition might be that they did not (r) know their own bounds, as the Council of *Antioch* determined, but ventured to appoint Church Officers, without the Bishops Consent. Upon which occasion *St. Basil* wrote a particular Epistle to the *Chorepiscopi*, requiring that no Minister (s) whatsoever, though of the lower rank, should be made without him, contrary to the Canons. "It is a sad thing, saith he, to see how the Canons of the Fathers are laid aside; insomuch

q Distin.  
42. c. 3.

r *et dicitur  
ut iussu  
pateret.*

s Epist.  
181. p. 959.  
Tom. 1.  
*Chorepiscopi  
et iussu  
pateret  
Rectoris  
et such  
Minister  
as those  
Lect 4. 10.*



" infomuch that it is to be feared all  
 " will come to Confusion. The An-  
 " cient Custom was this, That there  
 " should be a strict inquiry made into  
 " the lives of those who were to be  
 " admitted to minister in the Church.  
 " The care of this lay upon the Pres-  
 " byters and Deacons, who were to  
 " report it to the *Chorepiscopi*, and they  
 " having received a good testimony of  
 " them, certified it to the Bishop, and  
 " so the *Minister* (t) was admitted in-  
 " to Holy Orders: But now you  
 " *Country Bishops* would make me stand  
 " for a Cypher, and take all this Au-  
 " thority to your selves: nay, you  
 " permit the Presbyters and Deacons  
 " to put in whom they please, accord-  
 " ing as Kindred or Affection inclines  
 " them, without regard to their worth.  
 " But let me, saith he, have a note of  
 " the Ministers of every Village; and  
 " if any have been brought in by the  
 " Presbyters, let them be cast out again  
 " among the common people. And  
 " know that he shall be but a *Lay-man*  
 " whoever he is that is received into

(t) *ἀπο-  
 κρίναι  
 τὸν  
 μαρτυ-  
 ρισμὸν*

"the Ministry without our consent.

By this it is apparent that *Presbyters* had not power so much as to make the lowest Officers in the Church; and that the *Chorepiscopi*, though above the rest of the *Presbyters*, in Office, yet were not so high as *Bishops*, but were a middle sort of men between both. An image of whom was remaining in the late *Bohemian Church*, as I learn from *Comenius*; who in his Book concerning the Discipline and Order among them tells us, that beside the *Seniors* or *Bishops*, (u) and *Ministers* or *Presbyters*, they had certain Ecclesiastical Persons called *Conseniors*, who were between the other two. For they were chosen out of the *Ministers*, presented by them to the *Bishop*, and then solemnly ordained by him to the Office of *Conseniors* by a new imposition of hands. But at the same time these *Conseniors* promised Obedience to the *Bishop*; (x) as the *Ministers* when they were Ordained promised Obedience to them as well

u For they had Episcopal Ordination after they had been made *Presbyters*, and Episcopal Jurisdiction and Succession from the *Bishops* of the *Waldenses*.  
 x Ratio *Discipl. & Ord. Eccl.* cap. 3. p. 37.

as to the Bishop. (z) Their Office z lb. p. 12 therefore was among other things (as we are told, *Chap. 1. page 23, 24.*) to keep good Order, to observe what was worthy of correction, to inform the Bishop of it, to provide fit persons for the Ministry, to exercise Discipline with the Bishop, and visit with him, or without him if he required it, to examine those that were to be ordained Ministers or Deacons, to give them testimonials to the Bishop, and in short, *To supply the place of the Bishop in businesses of lesser moment.* So it appears by the Book, and by *Comenius* his Annotations upon that Chapter. (a)

a page 91.  
Minoribus  
in negotiis  
Episcopi  
vices ob-  
rent.

Thus much may suffice for the *Chorepiscopi* who had not such a power as he ascribes to them; and as the *Suffragans*, I shall now shew you, were invested withal; who were of the Order of Bishops as much as any other. Some have called them *Titular Bishops* ordained to assist and aid the Bishop of the Diocese in his Spirit-

V.

tual Function, and think they had their name from this, that *by their Suffrages Ecclesiastical Causes were judged.* But the better to understand what they were, you must know that all the Bishops of any Province were antiently called by the Metropolitan his *Suffragans*; being to advise and assist him in the common Affairs of the Church. So the word is often used in the Canon Law; and in latter times in the Provincial Council of *Salisbury* (b). The Archbishop *Everard* speaks to all the Bishops as his *Suffragans* being called together with him, *in partem sollicitudinis*; into part of the care of the people under his charge. Which are the words of our *Linwood* also, who saith the Bishops are called *Suffragans*, because they are bound to help and assist the Archbishop (c). But since those times, they only have been called *Suffragans* who were indeed ordained Bishops, but not possessed as yet of any See, and thence called *Titular Bishops*: which kind of Bishops are no stranger, than those Ministers

b An. 1420  
cap. de  
Officio Or-  
dian. ii.

c Archiepi-  
scopo suf-  
fragari &  
assistere te-  
nentur.  
Apoc. in  
cap. de  
Constitu-  
tionibus.

at

at Geneva, whom they call *Apostoli*, who preach in the Country Churches, and administer the Sacraments, but have no certain charge. Yet in *England* I must tell you it was otherwise, as appears by the Statute of 26. Hen. VIII. chap. 14. where provision is made for *Suffragans* which had been accustomed to be had within this Realm, as it tells us both in the beginning and the middle of it. And it is enacted that the Towns of *Thetford*, *Ipswich*, *Colchester*, *Dover*, *Guilford*, *Southampton*, and twenty places more besides them, should be taken and accepted for *Sees* of Bishops Suffragans to be made in this Realm, &c. For this end every Archbishop or Bishop being disposed to have them for the more speedy administration of Holy things, had the liberty given them to name and elect two fit persons, and present them to the King: who thereupon had full power by the Act to give to which of those two he pleased, the Stile, Title, and Name of Bishop of such of the *Sees* aforesaid as he thought

most expedient : and he was to be called *Bishop Suffragan* of the same See. After which the King was to present him by his Letters Patents under the great Seal to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, or of *York*, signifying his Name, his Stile, Title, and Dignity of Bishoprick; requiring him to Consecrate the said person so nominated and presented, to the same Name, Title, Stile, and Dignity of Bishop. For which purpose either the Bishop that nominated him, or the Suffragan himself was to provide two Bishops or Suffragans to consecrate him with the Archbishop, and to bear their reasonable costs. This Statute though repealed in the first and second of *Philip* and

d Chap. 8. *Mary* (d), yet was revived among

e Sec ch. 1. *Elizabeth* (e). And it is sufficiently manifest from thence that these persons had Episcopal Ordination (being Consecrated by the Archbishop, and two Bishops more) as much as any other. And therefore secondly, had Episcopal Power and Authority as much as the

the Bishop of the Diocess, though being dependent on him, the Suffragan could not use or execute any Jurisdiction, Power, or Authority but by his Commission under his Seal; as the Statute likewise provides. Upon which score Mr. *Mason* calls them *Secondary* (f) *Bishops*; and further observes truly, that though in compare with others they may seem to have nothing but a Title, because they had not their proper Diocesses to themselves; yet if we speak absolutely, they had both the Title and the thing signified by it. For they had for their Episcopal Seat some great Town (g) appointed to them by the Act of Parliament, in which, and some certain adjacent places to which the Bishop of the Diocess limited them, they exercised their Episcopal Function. From whence also they borrowed the name of Suffragan of *Bedford*: Suffragan of *Colchester*, &c. So that none of those who were Consecrated Bishops among us in *England*, whether *Primary* or *Secondary* (as his words are) were

meer-

f De Miss. Angl. l. 1. c. 3.

g Oppidum illustre longe Parliamentaria illis designatum.

merely *Titular*, but destinated all of them to the administration of a certain place, according to the sixth Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*. Accordingly we find that such Suffragans being made, acted like other Bishops in all things. For the Register of the Consecration of Archbishop *Parker* tells us, that at the time of it, *four Chairs were set for four Bishops*; one of which was *John Hodgskin* Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*: who assisted also in the Consecration of the Bishops of *London, Ely, Lincoln*, and divers others: which he could not have done had he not had Episcopal Power, and consequently the Power of Ordaining Presbyters, as well as of Consecrating Bishops. And so much this Apologist might have learnt from him whom he calls a *Learned Prelate*, if he had read his Books with care: I mean Bishop *Bramhall*, who writes thus of the Power of *Suffragans* (h): *The Office and the Benefice of a Bishop are two distinct things. Ordination is an Act of the Key of Order, and a Bishop unin-*

*h Ramphaa*  
Printed  
1659-P. 93



uninthroned may Ordain as well as a Bishop enthroned. The Ordination of Suffragan Bishops who had no peculiar Bishopricks was always admitted and reputed as good in the Catholick Church (if the Suffragans had Episcopal Ordination) as the Ordination of the greatest Bishops in the world. Nay, if he had but read their own Authors, he would not have doubted that Suffragans were altogether (to speak in their stile) as bad as Bishops. For the *Admonition* to the Parliament puts them among the Titles and Offices devised by Antichrist, and declares that though they take upon them (which is most horrible) to rule Gods Church, yet they are plainly by Christ forbidden, and utterly with speed to be removed. You may read more to the same purpose in the Preface, as I find it cited in the Censure of the Pamphlet called, *Humble Motives for Association*, An. 1601. p. 23, 25. In which year I find this a part of the *Secular Priests* complaint against the *Jesuites*, that they would not be subordinate in any manner to the Ordinary

† Dialogue  
between a  
Secular  
Priest, and  
a Lay  
Gentle-  
man, p. 73.  
87, 90.

‡ p. 13. of  
his Book.

\* As Mr.  
Clark tells  
us he was.  
Collect. of  
Lives of  
ren Di-  
vines, p.  
131.

nary Prelates of *England*, as *Bishops* and *Suffragans*: and that they withstood their endeavours to have *Bishops* or *Suffragans* (i). By which you may see they were numbred among the *Prelates* to whom all *Priests* were to be subject, which made those fiery Dissenters from our Church to declaim so lowdly against them. And all this serves to convince our *Apologist* of unskilfulness in these matters, who pronounces roundly that Mr. *Gataker* (k) never had any Episcopal Ordination, because he was Ordained by (a Suffragan of one of those places mentioned in the *Statute*, viz.) the *Suffragan* of *Colchester*. Suppose he were, \* he had notwithstanding Episcopal Ordination, as I have demonstrated; and as good as if he had been Ordained by the greatest Bishop in the World. But he did not understand I see by this what those Suffragans were, and contrary to what became an *humble* and *modest* man, and the Title likewise of his Book, wrote about things which he had not studied or considered.

Which

Which made him also confound these with the *Rural Deans*, alledging the Primate of *Armaghs* judgment concerning the power of Suffragans, to prove it to be his Judgment, that *the Chorepiscopi or Rural Deans might lawfully ordain*. In which he hath done him a notorious injury; for there is not such a word in his Book, as that the *Rural Deans may lawfully ordain*,  
“ But only that the number of Suffra-  
“ gans (which was 26) might well be  
“ conformed to the number of the se-  
“ veral Rural Deanries, and supply-  
“ ing the place of those who in the  
“ Ancient Church were called *Chore-*  
“ *piscopi*, might every month assemble  
“ a Synod of the Rectors within the  
“ Precinct, and conclude all matters  
“ brought before them by the major  
“ part of voices. These are his words,  
which do not signifie that *Suffragans*  
were the same with *Rural Deans*, or  
*Chorepiscopi*, but that there might be  
as many of the one, as there are of  
the other; and Suffragans do all that  
which those ancient Officers did,  
though

though they had power to do a great deal more : For I have proved a plain distinction between them. The *Chorepiscopi* were made by one single Bishop, viz. the Bishop of the City to whom they belonged, as the Council of *Antioch* tells us, *Can. 10.* But the *Suffragans* being real Bishops were made as other Bishops are by *three* at the least, according to the fourth Canon of the first Council at *Nice*. And so they had power to Ordain Presbyters, and joyn in the Consecration of other Bishops, which the *Chorepiscopi* had not. Nor did our Church ever acknowledge any such power residing in the Rural Deans, or any meer Presbyters subject to the Jurisdiction of our Bishops, to ordain Priests. But as *Hadrianus Saravia* tells the Ministers of *Guernsey* (1) in his Letter to them, *As many Ministers as were naturally of the Country being not made Ministers of the Church by their Bishop or his Demissories, nor any others according to the Order of the English Church, were not true and lawful Ministers. Where by Demissories*

(1) See *Clavi*  
*Trabales*,  
P. 142.

ries I think he means the Suffragans of the Bishop of *Winchester*, to whose jurisdiction they belonged.

Yes, may some say, our Bishops have sometimes declared otherwise. For this *Apologist* (m) alledges the story of the three Scots Bishops, who never had been ordained but by Presbyters, and yet Bishop *Bancrofts*' opinion was that they need not be ordained again; which hath often been alledged heretofore by others; particularly by the *Lancashire* Ministers of the first Classis at *Manchester*, in whom he might have found a great deal more than this amounts unto. For they fly to a Letter of the late Primate of *Ireland*, with the Animadversions of Dr. *Bernard* upon it (n), in which this Story is cited, and the judgment of many other learned Divines; but nothing at all to the business. For as the Gentlemen to whom the *Lancashire* Ministers wrote their Letter well observe (o) the Primate did not make void the Ordination by Presbyters, but it was with a special

VI.

m Pag. 131  
out of  
Archbish.  
Spotwood.

n The  
judgment  
of the late  
Archb. of  
Armagh,  
&c. 1658.

o Excom-  
municatio  
excommu-  
nicata,

special restriction to such places, *where Bishops could not be had*: Which are the very words also of Archbishop Bancroft in the case of the Scottish Bishops. As for the Ordinations made by our Presbyters the Primate declared himself against them in the very same Letter (which they craftily concealed) as you may read p. 112. of Dr. Bernard's Book. The words are these; *You may easily judge that the Ordination made by such Presbyters, as have severed themselves from those Bishops, unto whom they had sworn Canonical Obedience, cannot possibly by me be excused from being Schismatical.* Which I find cited again in another Book of his, called *Clavi Trabales*, p. 56. And both in that and the former Book (p) he tells us the Primate thought their Ordination void upon another score. Because at the imposition of hands, they neither used those antient words, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c.* nor the next, *Be thou a faithful dispenser, &c.* nor any other words to that sense (at least there is no order or direction for it.)

p Judg-  
ment of  
the Archb.  
p. 112, &c.  
*Clavi*  
*Trab.* p. 56.

it.) And they also wholly omitted those words at the solemn delivery of the Bible into the hands of the person ordained: *Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God, &c.* So that there being no exprefs transmission of Ministerial Power, he was wont to say, that such Imposition of hands (by some called the Seal of Ordination) without a Commission annexed, seemed to him to be *as the putting of a Seal to a Blank*. And if a Bishop had been present and done no more than they did, he thought the same quere might have been of the validity of such Ordinations.

As for other Reformed Churches, their case is widely different from that of these men, as he might have learnt from another Bishop, whom he cites now and then to no purpose, *viz.* Bishop *Bramhall* \*, who tells you, that he knew many learned persons among them who did passionately affect Episcopacy, and some of them acknowledged to him that their Church would never be rightly settled till it

\* Replied  
tion to the  
Bishop of  
Chalcedony  
p. 71 & 72

was new moulded. And others, he tells you, though they did not long for Episcopacy, yet they approve it, and want it only out of invincible necessity. And that their principal learned men were of this mind appears from hence; that Dr. *Carlson*, afterward Bishop of *Chichester*, protesting in open Synod (which then sate at *Dort*) that Christ instituted no parity, but made twelve Apostles the chief, and under them seventy Disciples; that Bishops succeeded to the Twelve, and Presbyters of inferiour rank to the Seventy; and challenging the judgment of any learned men that could speak to the contrary: Their answer was silence, which was approbation enough. And after, saith he, discoursing with divers of the best learned in the Synod, and telling them how necessary Bishops were to suppress their Schisms then rising; their answer was, *That they did much honour and reverence the good order and discipline of the Church of England, and with all their heart would be glad to have it established among them; but*  
*that*



that could not be hoped for in their State. Their hope was, that, seeing they could not do what they desired, God would be merciful to them, if they did but what they could. Upon which speech one well notes ( q ) that if they hoped for mercy that might pardon what they did, then they supposed they were not in the best estate; and that their necessity could not totally excuse them from fault, for then in that particular there had been no need to hope for mercy. Nor could they well think otherwise; since being pressed they denied not but that Episcopacy was of Christs own institution.

q Answer  
to a Letter  
written  
at Ox-  
ford, 1647.  
p. 13, 14.

To this necessity Mr. Calvin himself hath recourse, declaring that *their calling* ( being an extraordinary thing ) *ought not to be estimated by the common Rule.* It were to be wished indeed ( saies he in the same place ( r ) that there were a continual succession of Pastors, that the Function it self might be delivered, as it were, from hand to hand; but the Pope having broken the succession of such as preached the

r Epist. ad  
Regem  
1518,  
p. 142.

† *Expositio*  
*in E-*  
*vangel. Joh.*  
*Cap. 1.*

uncorrupted Doctrine of Christ, God provided a remedy, exciting pious and learned men to reform the Church, and committing to them an extraordinary Office. This saith *Melancthon* (f) God did in antient times, setting a greater value upon his Church, than upon the ordinary Power in it. If indeed the ordinary power would have done their duty, He is worthy, saith Mr. Calvin, of any execration who will not submit himself to that Hierarchy that submits it self to the Lord. And I protest before God and in mine own Conscience, saith *Zanchy*, that I hold them no better than *Schismaticks* that account or make it a part of Reformation of the Church to have no Bishops (r). Of this mind were the first Reformers, who, as the *Augustane* Confession saith, had no intention to deprive the Bishops of their Authority; but the Bishops refusing to admit them into holy Orders unless they would swear not to preach the pure Doctrine of the Gospel (u); this compelled them, the publick ordinary door

† Both  
 these cited  
 by Dr. Pe-  
 ter Maule  
 the Son;  
 in whom  
 you may  
 read a  
 great deal  
 more.  
 u Cap. ult.  
 de pnest.  
 Eccles.

door being shut, to enter into holy Orders in a private and extraordinary way. Yea, we have often testified, say the Authors of it, our great desire to preserve the Ecclesiastical Polity, and even those degrees in the Church which are but of Humane Authority. This we declare again and again to be our mind; *And this will and desire of ours shall excuse us before God and all the World to all Posterity, that the overthrow of the Authority of Bishops may not be imputed to us.* It was meer necessity you see which drove them to Ordination without Bishops, which sometimes makes that lawful, which otherwise would be unlawful. They are the words of the *Gloss* cited by Dr. *Craken-thorp* in this very business, who compares the Case of the *Reformers* with that of *Scipio*\*, as others I find have done since in his very words, without naming him. There being (as *Valerius Max.* tells us) a need of money to defray some necessary Charges of the Common-wealth, *Scipio* demanded a supply out of the Publick Treas-

\* *Defens.*  
*Eccles. An.*  
*glicana,*  
*Cap. 48.*  
*contra Spo-*  
*lat. 165.*

sure; Which the *Questors* refusing to open, because the Law seemed against it, He opened it himself by a private Key, and made the Law give way to utility and necessity. The same was done in some Reformed Churches. The Apostles had commended their Keys to Bishops; nor were they ever lawfully used, saith he, by any others than Bishops before that time. When the Roman *Questors* ( he means Bishops ) denying to open the door, and admit any to the Office of Pastors, unless they would ingage not to preach the pure Doctrine of the Gospel, Some great men, like *Scipio*, chose rather to lay hold on the Keys, and receive Ordination from the hands of private persons, than that the Church should be unfurnished and the People perish. They would not have gone out of the Rode if they could have avoided it, as our Presbyterians did of their own accord. Who ought therefore to acknowledge their error, to return into the regular course from whence they voluntarily strayed, and not

not stand upon the justification of their proceedings by the example of those who are nothing like them: But with all their heart would have intertained such Bishops as our pretended Reformers thrust out of possession, and joyfully received such Ordination as here they rejected. But if they resolve still to continue to maintain what they have done, I would wish them to get an abler Apologist than this man: and you, my good Friend, I would advise to keep this old Saying in your mind, *Remember not to trust*; no not those that pretend to *learning*, seriousness, humility, and modesty. For you see by what hath been said, that this person, who makes a shew of these qualities, is grossly mistaken (to speak no harsher word) and too boldly indeavours to lead others into errors. I acknowledge indeed that there are both learned and modest men among them; but they are the confident talkers who generally carry the Bell away, and are cried up for all worth and excellency. Do what I can, I must think there is too

Printed  
at th:  
Hague 1651  
by R. Wat-  
son, p. 151.

much truth in the censure passed upon  
you by the *Second fair warning to take*  
*heed of the Scottish Discipline* (y);

“ That you are not wont to prick any

“ in the List of the Learned, but the

“ best read men in *Synopsis's* and *Sy-*

“ *stems*, in *Common place* Books and

“ *Centurists*, or in your own Reformed

“ Fathers; whom you believe to be

“ more proper than the antients, be-

“ cause standing (as they tell you)

“ upon their shoulders: When, if set

“ on even ground, the longest arm they

“ can make in true Learning and Elo-

“ quence, will not reach half way up

“ to their girdles.

# VII.

But you may imagine perhaps, that  
though the *Apologist* be not so well  
versed in the Laws of the antient  
Church, yet he hath good skill in the  
Laws and Customs of our own Land.  
So indeed any body would think; that  
reads his Book, and relies upon his  
bare word; but he that hath so much  
*distrust* as to take the pains to examine  
what he saith, will presently discover  
that

that he writes as if he were as unacquainted with them as with the Laws and Customs of Japan. The same heady forwardness possesses men now that did in Gregory Nazianzen's days, when, as he tells us (x) all were wild to teach and talk about the Spirit of God, without the Spirit: and therefore no wonder they venture to talk of our Laws, without any Law. Thus this modest Apologist puts in their exception (a) against our Church for committing the power of Excommunication to men that are not in holy Orders. Which is notoriously false, and the contrary, I could shew him, hath been acknowledged in their own Books. But he needed have look'd no further than to a Book published not many years ago, concerning the Practice in the Ecclesiastical Courts. Where he might have been informed in express terms (b) That the Judge of the Court having pronounced a man contumacious, and decreed that he is to be excommunicated in punishment of his contumacy, next proceeds to read the Excommunication, if he be

z Oral. 9.  
p. 150. ubi  
sunt verba  
Xianz  
adversus 68.  
cap. 2.  
dey. Suppl.  
ad. &c.  
a Pag. 10.

b Francisci  
Clark Pra-  
xis in Cur-  
ria Eccles.  
Titul. 10.  
an. 1666.

be in holy Orders; Otherwise, he delivers it to be read by the Priest appointed by the Archbishop for this purpose: which Priest to this effect sits judicially with the Judge himself. Of if he never heard of this Book, yet he hath heard I am sure of the Third Part of the *Friendly Debate*: Where, if he had been pleased to read a Book before he had censured it, he might have found this bold Error corrected in *Philagathus*; and so avoided it himself. But I see plainly, and am heartily sorry for it, there are more of that mans evil humour; who love to talk of things upon Record, out of their own drowsie imaginations. The general cry against the *continuation of the Friendly Debate* was, that it was a breach of the Act of Indemnity, or Oblivion; which was raised meerly out of their own brains, that are stuff with words more than things, without consulting the Act it self. But this cry *Philagathus* followed with open mouth, and now he hath got another to bear him company; who deserves  
in



in like manner to be chastized for his bold folly. Especially since he mentions this so often; first in his Preface, then at least five (c) times in his Book, c. Pref. 34, 73, 106, 112, 150. and in one place affirms my Book seems to be a continued breach of the Act of Indemnity in the very design of it: And all this after I had evidently demonstrated in the *further Continuation* (which he also mentions p. 150.) that whatever it seems to him, this is a gross and impudent Calumny. But I shall spare him, notwithstanding this boldness, and have, I assure him, thrown away those apt illustrations of his Vanity, which offered themselves, because he hath more civility in him than the sober Answerer. I shall only desire him to follow his own advice which he gives me on this occasion (d) d. Pref. p. 8. viz. *To do justice upon himself, and execute his own Book in the flames*, for committing such crimes. For I must tell you there are a great many more of them. He tells you confidently that the Notes, commonly called the *Assemblies*, came out before the Assembly convened,

*convened, p. 15.* By which I see he is no better skill'd in *Ordinances* than in *Laws*. For the Ordinance for their convention bears date *June 12. 1643.* requiring them to meet the next first of *July*: And the Annotations came not out till two years after, in *1645 (e).*

e So it  
should be  
Printed in  
the *Friend-  
ly Debate,*  
not 1646.

But you may think perhaps they did not convene at the time appointed. Know therefore, that on *June 24. 1643.* all Ministers were required by an Order to pray on the next Fast for a blessing on the Assembly, who were to meet on Saturday *July 1.* and that accordingly they did meet on that day, as *Mr. Fuller* (quoted sometimes by this man) observes in his History:

f *July 19.*  
1644.

And not long after (f) I find presented an humble Petition for an extraordinary Fast, beseeching among other things, *that Justice might be executed on all de-*

\* *Aug. 10.*  
1643.

*linquents;* and after this an Order \* that those of them who were Residents in the Associated Counties should be desired to go down and stir up the People to rise in their defence. By which it appears they not only convened, but began

began at least to be busie about that which did not concern them long before those Notes saw the light. But let us pass by this: And observe rather how he satisfies in the lame excuse he makes for their not calling the Apostles alwaies by the name of *Saints*. In the judgment of our Church, saith he, it is not necessary, as may hence be concluded, *That in all the Collects for the days set apart to commemorate the holy Apostles in, there are but two wherein they are stiled Saints*. These are his words (g); but if you love truth, call to mind the Rule I gave you, and remember not to trust. Even they who call one another frequently by the name of *Saints* have not such a care, as one would expect, of common honesty, nor of their own fame neither; but will assert such manifest untruths as lie open to every eye. Turn to the Prayers for particular days in the Service Book, and you shall find that they who told him this (for I charitably suppose he took it upon trust) made no conscience of what they said.

For

[Pg. 45.]

h St. Ste-  
ven, St.  
John, St.  
Andrew,  
St. Paul,  
St. Mark,  
St. Philip  
and St.  
James, St.  
Peter and  
St. James.

For those glorious persons, whose memories are celebrated in our Church (and I hope always will be) are called no less than *nine times* in the very body of the Collects by the names of *Saints* (h). Seven of which were *Apostles*, and the other an *Evangelist*, and the first *Martyr*. And lest any one should imagine he made his observation by the old Common-Prayer Book, and thence may justify himself: you may understand that there is no difference in this point, but only in two of the Collects: in one of which in stead of *St. John the Evangelist* (as it is now) the words were the *blessed Apostle and Evangelist John*; and in the other, instead of *St. Philip and St. James*, it was, *St. Philip and other Apostles*. This may teach you to suspect the reasonings of these men (which may very well be thought to be exceeding careless) who are no more exact in reporting matters of Fact which lie before their eyes. But as for their stories which they spread up and down, and endeavour to propagate to posterity by

by stuffing their Books with them (as this man doth) there is the greatest cause to think that either they have no truth at all in them, or are very much altered from their original. You ought to let them pass for idle tales, unless you have better authority for them than these mens Books, who you see are so bold as to report notorious falshoods which every body can confute. Their Traditions you should look upon as of no more credit than the Popish *Legends*: It being so easie for men to forget the very words they heard, and to place others in their room; so common to add or leave out what is most material; so hard and often impossible to know all the circumstances in a business, which very much alter the case; and lastly, there being such a proneness in men to invent down-right falshoods, and to publish them for their own advantage. I have now given you an instance of it, and I can give you more. The three Covenanting Ministers, I find, in their answer to the Queries of the Divines

vines of *Aberdeen*, had the boldness to declare in Print, and positively aver, that his Majesties Commissioner rested satisfied with their Covenant, according to their explication of it: by which report they hoped to draw the people to a liking of it. But this was such a calumny that the *Commissioner* thought it necessary to clear himself of it by a *Manifest and Declaration* (i) to the contrary. Which brought them to a confession that indeed they never heard him say he was satisfied, but had only some probable reasons whereby they were induced to believe that he was. And indeed men easily believe what they have a mind unto. They believed, or at least gave it out even *in the Pulpit* (saith his Majesty) (k) that we intended to bring in Popery into all our Kingdoms, or at least a toleration of it: It was preached that the Service-Book was framed at *Rome*, and brought over by a Country man of theirs. They told the people that all *England* was of their opinion. And some desired them publickly to give thanks

i See his late Majesties Large Declaration, 1638. p. 111, 112.

k lb. page 405, 406.

thanks to God for the overthrow which the *Hollanders* had newly given the *Spanish* Fleet before *Dunkirk*, assuring them that it was no less to be celebrated than the deliverance in 88. all that Fleet being prepared at the Kings charge for their ruine and subversion. A most horrible thing, that in the House of God, and in that place of his House, which they called the *Chair of Truth*, men should deliver such things as either they did not know to be true, or did know to be false:

VIII.

But you will say we must be distinguished from the *Scottish* Presbyterians; they and we are not all of a mind. For they, for instance, believed *Ruling Elders* to be *Jure Divino*, but I knew few in England, saith this Writer, if any, that held that Office so; save only in a large sense, i. e. lawful and not contrary to Gods word (1). Goodly! he knew few or none; therefore there were none here in England that held Lay-Elders to be of  
E Divine

1 See  
p. 14.

Divine right. This is his reasoning (for he satisfies a question by these words) and a rare one it is, built altogether upon his own Ignorance. For we know not a *few* but *many* who were of this opinion. And if he had not been negligent where he was concern'd, and busie where he needed not have medled, he might have more easily known the mind of the *English* than of the *Scottish* Presbyterians. He, being one of that Party, should have here known one would think better than I, that the *London* Ministers and Elders met in a Provincial Assembly, *Novem.* 2. 1646. put forth a *Vindication of the Presbyterial Government*. In the very Title Page of which, they set this down among the Contents of the Book, that *the Ruling Elder is by Divine Right; and that it is the will of Jesus Christ, that ALL SORTS of persons should give an account of their Faith, to the Ministers and Elders before admission to the Supper of the Lord.* Which is more, I hope, than *not being repugnant to Gods Word.* In like manner



manner the *Lancashire* Ministers of the first Classis at *Manchester* declared after this (m), that they could not consent to part with the Ruling Elder, unless they should betray the truth of Christ, Rom. 12. 1 Cor. 12. 1 Tim. 5. These are the places they alledge to prove the Divine Authority of this new Order of Ecclesiastical Officers. By which you may see that I said they are *Change-lings* with more reason, than this *Apolo-gist* had to excuse them from it: For I wrote from what I knew, and He from what he knew not. But there is another thing which he apologizes for after the same manner, in the very language of his predecessor *Philagathus*, whom he was ashamed to own. *The horrid Murder of his late Majesty*, saith this Writer, *was never undertaken (that I know of) to be justified by any Minister in Print, but by J. G. that great Goliath and Champion of the Ar-minians*, p. 74. It is very likely that he is ignorant of this, as well as of other matters: but he must excuse us if we know more of these men, and

m. Aa.  
1657. in  
the Book  
called Ex-  
communi-  
catio Ex-  
comm. p.  
46.

such as were none of *J. G.*'s Disciples. There was one *L. S.* for instance, whom I have read, who maintains that desperate Fact, in a Book called *Natures Dowry, or The Peoples Native Liberty Asserted*. It was not Printed till the Year 1652. but written (as he tells us in the Epistle) three year before (just upon the Kings Murder) on occasion of a Question propounded to him by a Member of Parliament and Committee of State. In the first Chapter he determines; *Should any one* (it is easie to know whom he means) *by a reserved and merciless obstinacy be shut up and barricado'd against the Law, Counsel, and Prayers; I see not but a people may warrantably go about to break such a one, seeing he will not be bended by reason.* But look farther and you will find this to be the Title of the tenth Chapter, *That Kings agreeable to the Law of God, may in some cases be forcibly resisted by their Subjects, and likewise deposed.* In some cases indeed, he  
“ resolves, it may be the prudence of  
“ the people to pardon their Prince,  
“ not

“not observing his stipulation, but  
 “their promise is out of date, and  
 “cannot bind them to further subje-  
 “ction. Nay, he saith, A people whose  
 “Ancestors have for themselves and  
 “their posterity either *gratis*, or upon  
 “inconvenient Articles promised sub-  
 “jection and obeysance to any one  
 “and his Heirs, may lawfully re-  
 “nounce the ingagement and cast off  
 “the Yoke. And at the end of that  
 Chapter cites the Vote of Parliament  
 at the beginning of the Wars to justi-  
 fie his Doctrine, *That if the King*  
*raised Forces against the Parliament, he*  
*forfeited his Trust.* But proceed fur-  
 ther to the next Chapter, and you  
 will find he comes home to the busi-  
 ness, and determines, *That Kings may*  
*render themselves obnoxious to the pe-*  
*nalty of death, according to the Law of*  
*God, in some cases to be inflicted by pub-*  
*lick Authority, in others by private men.*  
 This is the Title of the Chapter. And  
 immediately he betakes himself to that  
 very Scripture upon which Mr. J.  
*Goldwin* grounded his whole discourse:

For the Chapter begins thus. "That  
 " Law, *Gen. 9, 6. who so sheds man's*  
 " *Blood, by man shall his Blood be shed :*  
 " reaches all the Sons of *Noah, Princes*  
 " *themselves, though they be taller than*  
 " *their Brethren by the head and shoul-*  
 " *ders. And he explains it thus ; whether*  
 " *be shed it by himself, or by the Ministry, of*  
 " *some other ; whether a stranger or a neigh-*  
 " *bour, whether alone, or with the help of*  
 " *others, he is a Son of Death : no mortal*  
 " *is excused by his greatness. And adds,*  
 " most ridiculously, " *Plato is very Or-*  
 " *thodox in this point ; and concludes*  
 " *that Princes in some other cases are*  
 " *liable to capital punishment to be*  
 " *inflicted by private men. As if a*  
 " *Prince attempt to murder another,*  
 " *that person invaded may lawfully kill*  
 " *him in his own defence, nay, is bound*  
 " *by the sixth Commandement to do it, ra-*  
 " *ther than suffer himself to be murdered.*  
 " The rest of the Book is an answer (af-  
 " ter a strange fashion ) to those places  
 " of Scripture which are brought (as he  
 " speaks) for the impunity of Tyrants.  
 " I will mention but one of his desperate  
 " devices,

deyices, which you may find in the 18 Chapter to excuse *Dauids* sparing of *Saul*. It is not impossible (you see the stile wherein they deceived the people and put off their Ware) that *Dauids* interest might insensibly bias him into a tender care of the King. However, this he determines, "That either "*David* sinned in sparing of *Saul*, or "*else* his clemency was warranted by "*some* precept, or permission, which "*is* not extant in Scripture; and "*which* in all probability was peculiarly given to *David*. Here is enough to shew what *Divines* have come out of their School, and how readily they can suppose a Divine Precept for any thing they have a mind to, though there be not the least foot-step of it in Holy Writ. If he be not satisfied, but hath a list to stir further in this business (which he had better never have touched) I will furnish him with more, whom I am unwilling to mention. Let me only add that they were the *Presbyterian* Principles, out of which the *Independent* Army drew

a Politick  
Cate-  
chism, Li-  
cenced by  
Mr. White,  
May 20.  
1643.

their worst Conclusions. The discourse of this man now named is bottom'd upon this Maxime, that *the People are the Original of Power*. A doctrine asserted in another *Catechism* (n) of yours, & Licenced by a known person, of the highest esteem (as I can prove) among you. And this consequence is thence drawn from it, *That whatsoever the people have not expressly granted, they keep to themselves*: The King must produce his Grant, and not the people shew their reservation, for all is presumed to be reserved, which cannot be proved to be granted. Which being once supposed, he is stark blind, I think, who sees not the unavoidable consequence of all the mischief that ensued. And to speak freely, he that considers, saith a *History* (o) in those days, "The terms to which the King was held, even when the *Presbyterians* had the better end of the staff (as that he should not dispose of the Militia, of the Officers of the Crown, of his Children, have no Negative Vote, &c.) will conclude that

a History  
of the En-  
glish Scot-  
tish  
Presbyte-  
ry, written  
in French,  
1610.  
translated,  
1659.

“ that he was only left to his choice,  
 “ whether he would be destroyed by  
 “ his Enemies, or by his own proper  
 “ Act. For if he condescended not to  
 “ these demands, being then in their  
 “ hands that made them, the least he  
 “ could expect was to be deposed, and  
 “ if he granted them, he deposed him-  
 “ self. Nay, \*he that considers how all  
 “ along they supposed they were his  
 “ Superiours, to whom he was ac-  
 “ countable, will clearly discern, that  
 “ it was upon the *Presbyterian* Princi-  
 “ ples that the *Independents* built their  
 “ conclusions. And if it were lawful  
 “ for them to wrest out of his hands,  
 “ the Sword of the *Militia*, and to  
 “ use it against him, it was no less law-  
 “ ful, thought the other, to imploy  
 “ the Sword of *Justice* against him. At  
 “ least after they had taken from him  
 “ his Sword, his Revenues, his Servants,  
 “ his Children, the liberty of his Per-  
 “ son, and, which is more, of his Con-  
 “ science, they left the *Independents*  
 “ but one step further to go, which  
 “ was to take away his life: and all  
 that

"that in which they surpass'd the  
 "others was, that they gave the last  
 "blow to him. All which I have re-  
 membred, not to load any man with  
 reproaches, but to make them all  
 humble in consideration of their past  
 miscarriages (to say no worse) where-  
 of I truly hope many of them repent.  
*The latter day is the scholar of the for-*  
*mer*: and no man is too old to learn;  
 especially the amendment of his faults.  
 Which the more ingeniously he con-  
 fesses, and the less he defends, the  
 more likely he is to become a new  
 man. I should have been glad to have  
 seen something of this in this Apolo-  
 gift, which would better have becom-  
 ed him than to talk of *Noli me tan-*  
*gere's* in my Book, and to hunt about  
 for excuses of all things, nay, to waste  
 his time in impertinent reflections on  
 others, in stead of acknowledging or  
 taking off the blame from themselves.  
 J. G. he tells you, who justified the  
 Kings Murder, was the *Great Goliath*  
*and Champion of the Arminians*. What  
 of all that, I pray you? what affinity  
 hath



hath *Arminius* his Doctrine with King-killing, or what Antidote is there in Mr. *Calvins* against it? I never heard the former taxed with any thing of this nature, though there is a dangerous passage in the last Chapter of Mr. *Calvins* institutions (p); which many have p Num. 31 observed, if the three orders of a Kingdom have such a power of Kings as he thinks, it is possible, they may have. And yet I believe a man may be a *Calvinist* (as they speak) and be a good subject, and of the contrary persuasion, and be a bad: those things wherein they differ having nothing to do with this matter. But he was resolv'd to have a fling at the *Arminians* (whom he thinks to hit, I cannot tell: me he doth not hurt, who belong to neither of those parties) nay, he touches this difference I know not how oft, in his Apology; though I gave him no occasion for it: loving, lapwing-like, to make the most pewing and crying when he is farthest from his nest. He should rather have minded what I cited out of Mr. *Calvin*, whom I perceive he favours more than  
the

the other, concerning the points in debate between us. I told you his thoughts of *Schism*, and I could add a great deal more (out of other places of his works) of the great dread he was in of this sin; of the dislike he expressed that Bish. *Hooper* should contend so much about a *Cap and a Surplice*; and of his opinion about *Humane Traditions*; but that I should then digress too far out of the way, and prevent my self in that which remains of this Apology.

## IX.

Let us therefore return back to it, and, that you may be more wary hereafter in trusting these men, let me mind you of as notorious a Calumny, as ever I read, wherewith he asperses some Members of this Church. You will find it in his *Preface*, p. 11. where he saith, *I cannot but own my utter dislike of the Principles and Practices of some high Conformists, or Hectors for Conformity; namely, such as prefer the Romish Church before the Reformed transmarine Churches; Arminius before*  
St.

St. Austin; who judge Acrius a greater Heretick than Arius; who have more charity for those that deny the Deity of our Saviour, than for those that scruple the strict Jus Divinum. of Episcopacy; and who can with more patience bear a dispute against the very being of a Deity, than about the taking away of a Ceremony, &c. This is the language not of the bold blades, but of a modest Presbyterian, of one that uses hard reasons and soft words, if you will believe himself in the very leaf before-<sup>q Preface</sup> going ( q ). Whatsoever charity they <sup>p 9.</sup> have for us, their good words shall never be wanting to themselves. They will call themselves *humble* and *modest*, whatsoever they say or do: Though they blush not to defend themselves by injuring any body, nor fear to cast reproaches on whomsoever, that for defence of the truth stand in their way. For every part of this Charge is a vile slander, and some of it is confuted, you shall see, by himself. Which that I may demonstrate, let me tell you,

In the first place, that it is no *Heterism*

*rism* to assert the *Divine Right* of Episcopacy in the strictest sense. This is no upstart opinion, broached<sup>d</sup> by some swaggering hot-brain'd men, who love to rant and vapour beyond other Folk (which is the proper quality of a *Hector*) but hath been antiently believed in this Church, from the very beginning of the Reformation, and maintained by the soberest men in it. I know they would have you to think otherwise, and have endeavoured to perswade the World that it is a novel Doctrine advanced of later times by some proud and haughty Divines. Mr. *Robert Bailly* made bold to say that before Bishop *Bancrofts* time, the Bishops did unanimously deny Episcopacy to be of *Divine Right* (1). And the Letter to Dr. *Samuel Turner*, Printed 1647. Will not allow it to be so Antient; but affirms (p. 3.) that it is an opinion but lately countenanced in England, and that by some of the more Lordly Clergy. He means, I think, Archbishop *Laud*, as some since have explained it. But both the one and the other of these, talk'd

7 Reply to  
fair warn-  
ing p. 49.

Printed at  
Delf, 1649

talk'd at random, out of their own imaginations, not from Historical observation. *Archbishop Whitgift*, and *Bishop Bilson*, as the Answer to that Letter suggests, were both of a contrary perswasion. And I can name a Divine of their Opinion elder than either, and much revered even by the Presbyterians, who was offered a Bishoprick also, but refused it: And that is Old *Bernard Gilpin*, who left the World that very year in which *Bishop Whitgift* was advanced to the See of *Canterbury*, 1583. For when *Mr. Cartwrights* book was newly come forth, a certain *Cambridge* man, who seemed a very great Scholar, came to this famous Preacher, and dealt very earnestly with him about the Discipline and Reformation of the Church. But *Mr. Gilmans* answer was, *That he could not allow that any Humane invention should take place in the Church in stead of a Divine Institution*. How, said the man, do you think that this Form of Discipline is an Humane Invention? I am, said *Mr. Gilpin*, altogether of that

that

that mind; And as many as diligently turn over the Writings of the Fathers will be of my opinion. O but the later men, replied the *Disciplinarian*, see many things which those antient Fathers saw not; and the present Church seems better provided of many ingenious and industrious men. At which Mr. *Gilpin*, saith my Author (f) seemed somewhat moved, and answered; *I, for my part, do not hold the virtues of the later men to be compared to the Infirmities of the Fathers.* Which words he used on purpose, because he perceived this young man had a strong conceit of I know not what rare virtues in himself; which opinion the good old man was desirous to root out of him.

f Life of  
Bernard  
Gilpin,  
Edit. 4.  
1636.  
p. 106,  
107, &c.

But there is an Authority ancienter than all these, viz. *The Form and Order of making and consecrating Bishops, &c.* confirmed by Act of Parliament. In which *three* things are considerable; The very first words of the *Preface* are, *That, it is evident to all men reading the holy Scriptures and antient Authors, that*  
from

from the Apostles time, there have been these Orders in Christs Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Then secondly, the Prayer after the *Letany* at the Consecration of a Bishop, begins in this manner: *Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by thy holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church, &c.* (which must needs be understood of those before named) And, lastly, the first question to the person to be Consecrated is, *Are you perswaded that you be called to this Ministration according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ?* To which the Answer is, *I am so perswaded.* Put now all these together and you will not be able to conceive (as the *Answer to the Letter* (1) observes) how these words should fall from any men not possessed with this Tenet, that Episcopacy is of *Divine Right*, in the strictest sense. For if God by his holy Spirit hath appointed divers Orders of Ministers in the Church; and we may find evidently by Scripture and antient Writers that there are three Orders,

F whereof

whereof Bishops the highest ; and this is made the ground of praying for the Bishop to be Consecrated ; and he must profess he is perswaded that he is called to that Ministration according to Christs will, then Episcopacy ( in the opinion of those who composed and confirmed this Book ) is in such a manner according to Christs Will, that it is grounded in Scripture, and appointed by the Spirit of God ; and all this hath not been said only of late, nor countenanced only by some few, and those of the more Lordly Clergy.

2. For which cause, no man ought to be disgraced with any odious name, much less be called an *Hector*, who is now of the same Perswasion. The most illustrious persons that have been in our Church, men far from that boisterous humour, have declared themselves for this Doctrine, and doubted not but they could maintain it. I need instance in no more than two : Bishop *Andrews*, whose mind is well known from his three Letters to *Peter du Moulin*



*Moulin*, 1618. (u) to which I refer you: and the late Bishop *Sanderſon*, whom the beſt of you have ſpoke of with honour and reverence. He declares his opinion to be that Episcopall Government is not to be derived merely from *Apoſtolical* Practice or Institution, but that it is originally founded in the Perſon and Office of the *Meſſias*, our bleſſed Lord Chriſt (x), who being ſent by his Father, afterward ſent his Apoſtles to execute the ſame *Apoſtolical, Episcopall, Paſtoral* Office, for the Ordering and Governing of his Church till his coming again: and ſo the ſame Office to continue in *them* and their *Successors* to the end of the World. But ſuppoſe all our Churchmen had been ſilent, or that they are of no eſteem with our Adverſaries, yet ſince this Opinion of the *Divine Right* of Episcopacy hath been aſſerted by other Divines whom they reſpect, it ought not to have been reproached. *Bucer* declares in his Book of the *Kingdom of Chriſt* (as I find him cited above 60 years ago (y) juſt as our Book of

a Tranſlated and Printed, 1647.

2 Poſt-ſcripts to Episcopacy not preſudicial to Regal Power.

y Regiſtrament of the Church by Mr. Tho. Bellamy 9c

F a

Con-

Consecration doth, that it seemed good to the Holy Ghost that one, to whom the name of Bishop was peculiarly attributed) should take the care of the Churches, and preside over all the Presbyters. And nearer still to the very words of our Book, in his Treatise of the *power and use of the Ministry*, as he is alledged by *Saravia*. These Orders of Ministers have been perpetual in the Church, and were presently in the beginning appointed by the Holy Ghost, of *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*. He that will see more to this purpose may read Bishop *Mortons* Episcopacy Asserted, *Chap. 5. Sect. 4.* Nay, this is the Language of Antiquity; and they may as well call *St. Gregory of Nazianzum* a *Hector* as any of us: For he sticks not to tell his Auditors in plain words, that he held his Office by the Law of Christ. You may find the passage in his seventeenth Oration (2,) where, after he had exhorted all the People to obedience, he turns his speech more particularly to the Rulers and Magistrates, asking them if they will

will give him leave to speak freely : As truly, saith he, I think I may, since *the Law of Christ* hath made you subject to my Power, and to my Tribunal.

3. This you may think is very high: but I must let you know they who seem to lay their claim lower, and speak in a more humble stile ( as some love to call it ) differ but in a verbal nicety : in the different manner of expressing the same thing, rather than in their different judgment upon the substance of the matter. So that excellent Bishop, lately mentioned ( *Dr. Sander-son* ) hath clearly resolved ( *a* ). For sometimes this term *Divine Right* imports a Divine Precept ( which is the first and most proper signification ) when it appeareth by some clear express, and peremptory *Command of God* in his Word, to be the *Will of God* that the thing so commanded should be perpetually and universally observed. And that the Government of the Church by Bishops is of Divine Right in this stricter sense is an Opinion, saith

*a* Episcopacy not prejudicial to Regal Power, P. 12, 13.

he, at least of great probability, and such as may more easily and on better grounds be defended than confuted. But they that chuse to speak otherwise, understand by *Divine Right*, an Authority for a thing from the *Institution*, *Example*, or *Approbation* either of *Christ*, or of his *Apostles*, &c. which is a secondary meaning of the term, but not much distant from the former. For the Observation of the *Lords Day* depends on this Divine Right; and there is as much to shew (as he saith p. 19.) if not more, for such a Divine Right of *Episcopacy*, as for the Divine Right of *that day*. So that whosoever they be that either wave the term *Divine Right*, or else so expound it as not of necessity to import any more than an Apostolical Institution; "Yet  
 " the Apostles Authority (b) in the  
 " Institution of Episcopacy, being  
 " warranted by the Example, and (as  
 " they doubt not) by the direction of  
 " their Master *Jesus Christ*, they wor-  
 " thily esteem to be so reverend and  
 " obligatory; as that they would not  
 " for

b 2b. page  
39, 40.

“for a world have any hand in, or wil-  
 “lingly and deliberately contribute  
 “the least assistance towards the ex-  
 “tirpation of that Government; but  
 “rather hold themselves obliged in  
 “their Consciences, to the utmost of  
 “their power, to endeavour the pre-  
 “servation and continuance of it in  
 “these Churches, and do heartily  
 “wish the restitution and establish-  
 “ment of the same wheresoever it is  
 “not, &c,

Now that Episcopacy is of such in-  
 stitution, and so of *Divine Right*, he  
 further adds (c), is in truth a part of c v. 1b. p.  
 the established Doctrine of the <sup>18.</sup>  
 Church of *England*, and *hath been*  
*constantly and uniformly maintain'd by*  
*our best Writers* [mark these words]  
*and by all the Sober, Orderly, and Ortho-*  
*dox Sons of the Church.*

This is sufficient to shew that there  
 ought to be no such distinction made,  
 as we find in this man, between *high*  
 and *low* Conformists: since all have  
 spoken to the same effect, and yet were  
 no *Swasbucklers*, but, in this great

persons opinion, the Sober, Orderly; and Orthodox Sons of the Church.

4. But let us suppose there is some difference, yet they that have spoken the highest words of Episcopacy never thought *Aerius* a greater Heretick than *Arius*, nor had more Charity for those that deny our Saviour's Deity, than for those that scruple the strict *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy. No, this is a suggestion from the Father of lyes, the Calumniator of the Brethren, and seem to me to be the words of one whose tongue is set on fire of Hell. For though our best Divines have called it the *Heresie of Arius* (d), to affirm that there ought to be no imparity in the Church, or distinction between Bishops and Presbyters; and determined that this imparity was instituted and approved by the Apostles; yet they have declared withal, that they who think as *Aerius* did, are so far from being in a worse case than *Arius* was, that they are not in so bad. Let but obstinacy and perverseness be wanting, it will be no Heresie; and if it be  
Heresie

d Doctor  
Cracken-  
shorp, De-  
fect. Eccl.  
Anglicana,  
p. 241, 242

*Heretic (being about a point of Discipline) it will not be among those which St. Peter calls damnable Heresies (c).*

*1 Bishop  
Answers  
3. Letter,  
P. 56, 57.*

These are the words of one who was as vehement an Assertor of the *Divine Right* of Episcopacy, as any hath been (and there are none among us but will subscribe to them) who is so far, you see, from making *Aerius* a greater Heretick than *Arius*, that his words plainly make him less.

5. But these perhaps are such *Heteroly* Divines, you may think, that they mind not what they say: so be-like, if it be true which he says just before, that they prefer *Arminius* before *St. Austin*. A very strange humour! that these high Episcopal men should set a *Presbyterian* Divine above a great *Bishop*. But suppose, upon other scores, they should be so phantastical, yet this part of his accusation will contradict the calumny next before it, namely, that they prefer the *Romish Church* before the *Reformed Transmarine Churches*. How can that be, when the *Arminians* are among those Reformed Churches,

f Letter to  
his Legate  
in the  
Council  
of Trent.  
See p. 646.  
Engl. Edit.  
1619.

g Bishop  
Andrews  
Letter to  
du Moulin,  
ib.

Churches, for whom it seems they have such a great affection; and when the Pope himself, as every one knows that understands these matters, is against the *Divine Right* of Bishops? nay declared, when time was (f) that the opinion which makes them hold by that Title, *is false and erroneous*? But not to leave the least speck of his dirt sticking on us (which he blushes not to throw in our faces once more, p. 34.) you may know that the very same Bishop newly mentioned wipes it all off himself, by clearing and excusing the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas from sinning against the *Divine Right*, though they had no Bishops whom he thought to be of Divine Right in the strictest sense. *I said no such thing* (as his words are) (g) *but only this, that your Churches wanted something that is of Divine Right. Wanted, not by your fault, but by the iniquity of the times; for that your France had not your Kings so propitious at the Reformation of your Church, as our England had. In like manner the late Primate of Ireland,*  
Bishop



Bishop Bramhall excuses those in the Reformed Churches, who, as I told you, either had a desire, or but an esteem of Episcopacy, though they could not enjoy it. And as for a third sort who were so far from either of those, that they condemned it as an Antichristian Innovation, and a rag of Popery, whereby they became guilty, he thought, of most gross Schism materially, he saith thus much may be alledged to mitigate their fault; *That they do it ignorantly (h), as they have been mis-taught, and mis-informed; and I hope that many of them are free from obstinacy, and hold the truth implicitly in the preparation of their minds, because ready to receive it when God shall reveal it to them.* Nay, Dr. Heylin himself (whom this man thinks so fierce) makes an Apology for their Ministers not being Ordained by Bishops at the first Reformation; there being he thinks a necessity for it; as you may read in his *History of Episcopacy*, p. 164. And lastly, a famous person now alive this Apologist cites afterward

*h* Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon, p. 71. 72.

i page 10.

8 p. 194,  
198.

terward against his own self. Master *Thorndike* I mean, who he acknowledges (i), - hath a charity for the Churches beyond the Seas, though wanting Bishops, whom he doubts not to be of *Divine Right*. But he might have had recourse to a better place of his works for this purpose, than that which he hath produced. For he handles this question at large in his Book of the *Rights of the Church* (k), where he excuses their necessity, and concludes at last out of the abundance of his Charity, that some excuse is to be made for those who have created this necessity to themselves by their own false perswasion. Let this man therefore do open penance for his sin in laying such foul things to the charge of the men of the *high Prelacy*, as he in scorn calls them, p. 35. And let him forbear if he can to say hereafter, *That there is just cause to fear that some among us have a greater Charity for the Church of Rome, than the* Presbyterians (l): And to intimate that the *high Conformists* are warping from the

i page 34.

the Doctrine of the Church of *Eng-land*, and lean more to that of *Trent*:

(m) For these are only old Calumnies now revived; I wish it be not to serve the Good Old Cause. We were told before the War that the Bishops were *leaned* toward Popery, nay, were *driving fast* toward Popery. And no sooner was it begun, but our neighbours were born in hand, that we had

a *company of half Papish Bishops* (n); nay that they were altogether *Papists*, one and the same brood with the *Jesuits* (o), and intended to bring *Popery* into *England*: all which they affirmed *was as clear as the bright noon-day* (p)

For to this end (saith this impudent Libel) they had stript all the Assemblies of their *faithfullest Preachers*, and used many other means to *banish wholly* all saving knowledge out of the Kingdom, that so they might the better draw the people to Popery. From which considerations, the Author desires the *Lords* and Inhabitants of the *United Netherlands* (q) not to assist the King; for if he prevailed, the Govern-

ment

a Dialogue between an Englishman & a Neatherlander, written in Low-Dutch, and transcribed into English; 1643. p. 7.

p. 8. 16. p. page 10.

q In the Dedication Epistle.

ment would be altered; Religion suppressed, the Bishops restored and put in force their Popish Canons. And all this I must tell you, was writ by a *Presbyterian* (a *modest* Gentleman no doubt, otherwise called a *shameless* liar) as appears by this passage, p. 37. where he saith, *Our whole Nation is by the coming in of the Scots* (before the War) *yet more confirmed that they were led by Gods Spirit.*—What was the woful issue of those suggestions we all know, though there was nothing of truth in them; as appeared by the stout opposition against the common enemy which some of those very men made, who (besides their other sufferings) had layen as deep under the suspicion of being Popishly affected, as any other of their Brethren whosoever (r). And what they now intend that begin again to buzz the same tale in the peoples ears, we are not so doltish as not to understand, and, when opportunity shall serve, they will more openly declare. Then you may hear the complaints renewed (which be re-  
members

† See Bishop Sanders preface to 1. Volume of Serm. Ser. 17.

members out of Mr. Fuller his Church-History) of *Papery*, *Arminianism*, *Socinianism*, and what not? You may hear an Accusation against a Minister (as the same Historian tells us there was on his own knowledge) (f) merely for using the *Gloria Patri*, though in all things else he conformed to the *Directory*.

/ Book the  
11. page  
224.

6. In which case truly, there might have been some colour to charge the Accusers as more zealous for their *Directory* than for our Saviours *Deity*: But to impeach any of us as more concerned for the *Divine Right* of Bishops than for the *Divine Nature* of our Lord the great Bishop of our souls, is a bold-fac'd calumny, for which there is no pretence at all. And yet he thinks he hath not said enough: for he tells you further, that these *High Conformists* or *Hectors* can with more patience hear a *Dispute* against the very being of a *Deity*, than about the taking away of a *Ceremony*. Which is the very highest strain of railing that the wit of a *modest Presbyterian* can invent.

11

invent. But to what pitch the more impudent may reach, who can tell? They may say that these *Conformists* are perfect *Atheists*, since they are already, it seems, such *Fools* as to bear more meekly with those who go about to Dethrone the object of all worship, than with those who only pluck away a Ceremony of it, *Dull Asses!* how should their Ceremonies stand, if the very sense of a Deity fall down? If he can find me any such *Beasts* as these, I shall easily believe the worst that he or his Complices can say of them. But the truth is, he is only disgorging his stomach all this while, and now, as I said, is come to the last strain, which brings up the foulest stuff of all. For the highest words that the *highest Sons, or Fathers of this Church* (to use his phrase) have spoken concerning *Ceremonies* are these (1): “That they are advancements of Order, Decency, Modesty, and Gravity in the Service of God; expressions of those heavenly desires and dispositions, which we ought

1 Bishop  
Bramhall  
in his  
Remphas,  
chap. 11.  
p. 234.

"ought to bring along with us to  
 "Gods House ; adjuments of Atten-  
 "tion and Devotion : furtherances of  
 "Edification ; visible Instructors ;  
 "helps of Memory ; exercises of  
 "Faith ; *the shell that preserves the*  
 "*kernel of Religion from contempt ;*  
 "*the leaves that defend the blossoms*  
 "*and the fruit.* But the very same  
 "person who wrote all this immedi-  
 ately adds , that *if they grow over*  
*thick and ranck, they hinder the fruit*  
*from coming to maturity , and then the*  
*Gardener plucks them off.* "When Ce-  
 "remonies become burdensome by  
 "excessive superfluity , or unlawful  
 "Ceremonies are obtruded , or the  
 "substance of Divine Worship is pla-  
 "ced in Circumstances , or the Ser-  
 "vice of God is more respected for  
 "Humane Ornaments , than for the  
 "Divine Ordinance ; it is high time  
 "to pare away excesses , and reduce  
 "things to the antient mean. So our  
 Church hath done ; between whom  
 and the Roman Church there is as  
 wide a difference in this regard , as

G

between

between the hearty expressions of a faithful friend, and the mimical gestures of a fawning flatterer: or between the unaffected comeliness of a grave Matron, and the fantastical paintings and patchings, and powdering of a garish Curtesan. And whereas this man would have you believe that there are those who are so enamoured of these few Ceremonies, that they even dote upon them; nay, have set their hearts upon them more than upon Almighty God himself. Another great Prelate (u) hath declared, *That he knew no true Son of the Church of England, that doteth upon any Ceremony*: whatsoever opinion they have of the *decency* or *expediency* of some of them. Nor doth this Gentleman, I have reason to believe, know such an one at this day. “For they have been told a thousand times over (as that Bishop proceeds) (x) in the *Sermons* and *Writings* of private men (as well as in the Publick Declaration of our Church) that we place no necessity at

Bishop  
Sanderson  
Preface to  
the first  
Volume of  
Serm. lect.  
12. An.  
1657.

x B. lect.

11.



"at all in these things, but hold them  
 "to be merely indifferent. 2. That  
 "when for Decency, Order, or  
 "Uniformity sake any constituti-  
 "ons are made, there is the same  
 "necessity of obeying such constitu-  
 "tions, as of obeying other Laws  
 "made for the good of the Com-  
 "monwealth concerning any other  
 "indifferent thing. And 3. That  
 "this necessity, whether of the one or  
 "of the other, arises not properly from  
 "the Authority of the immediate  
 "Law-giver, but from the Ordinance  
 "of God who hath commanded us  
 "to obey the Ordinances of men for  
 "his sake. And, to add no more, 4.  
 "That such necessity of Obedience  
 "notwithstanding, the things remain  
 "in the same indifferency as before;  
 "every way as to their *Nature*, and  
 "even in respect of us, thus far, That  
 "there is a liberty left for men upon  
 "extraordinary and other *just oc-*  
 "*casions, sometimes* to do otherwise  
 "than the constitution requires, when  
 "there is no *scandal* nor *contempt* in

"the case. A liberty which we dare not  
 "either take our selves, or allow to  
 "others in things properly and abso-  
 "lutely necessary. Upon which ve-  
 "ry account (I mean the considerati-  
 "on of the indifferency of the things  
 "in themselves) and upon this alone  
 "it was that those who did most sad-  
 "ly resent the voting down of *Liturgies*,  
 "*Festivals*, and the Ceremonies of the  
 "Church, did yet so far yield to the  
 "sway of the times, as to forbear the  
 "use thereof in publick Worship.  
 Which is a direct answer to that  
 which this Apologist talks of, about  
 our omission of things required by  
 Law in the late times. p. 128. And he  
 may find more full satisfaction, if he  
 be disposed, in the same Bishops se-  
 venth Sermon to *the people* (y); where  
 he shews, that since the obligation  
 to those doth not spring from the  
 things themselves, nor immediately  
 and by its proper virtue from the con-  
 stitution of the Magistrate, but by con-  
 sequence only, and by virtue of that  
 Law of God which commands to  
 obey

y First  
 Volume of  
 Sermons  
 in Folio.  
 Page 390.

obey them ; thereby a liberty is left in cases *extraordinary*, and of some *pressing necessity*, not otherwise well to be avoided, to do sometimes otherwise : these two things provided. *First*, that a man be driven thereto by a true real, and not by a pretended necessity only : and *secondly*, that in the manner of doing he use such Godly discretion as neither to shew the least *contempt* of the Law in himself, nor to give *ill example* to others to despise Government, or Governours.

7. This is the sum of what our Church-men, high and low (as he is pleased to distinguish them) have declared about Ceremonies. O but, saith the *Apologist*, why then will you not consent to a change, nay, a laying aside all those Ceremonies, since you do not make them necessary in themselves ? Let them be *removed whether nocent or innocent, as they have been out of other Reformed Churches.* page 18. This he is at again, page 131. and propounds this as a good means to keep the people from *grieving*

ving and vexing the Magistrate by the breach of his Laws: *Remove the Law*, saith he, *and where there is no Law, there is no Transgression*, p. 133. very right; nor is there any obedience. He hath found out a rare way for the Magistrate to ease himself wholly of his Office, by letting the people do as they will, and govern him. For when they please to scruple any other Laws, he must repeal them too, according to this wise advice, unless he will be vexed and grieved with the clamours and disobedience of his people, who will not be contented unless, in effect, they make Laws for themselves. King James indeed in his Proclamation in the first year of his Reign, *March 5.* admonishes all men hereafter, *not to expect, nor attempt* so much as any *further change in the common and publick Form of Gods Service, from that which was then established.* For which he there gives such substantial reasons, that my Lord Bacon (x) makes it his request to the Duke of Buckingham

ingham to read that excellent Proclamation, as he calls it; *And if at any time there should be the least motion made for innovation, to put the King in mind to read it himself*; for it is most dangerous in a state to give ear to the least alteration in Government. But it is all one for that; no matter what the King said, or any one else, they have been ever since, and are not merely for alterations, but for abolishing and removals, or else there will be no peace. I am heartily sorry for it; since even those whom they call the most moderate Prelates, have declared the removal of that which is well settled to be so dangerous, as that it is not safe to remove an inconvenience, the remedy of which may open a gap to let in others that may prove greater and more grievous. Not only Bishop *Sanderfon* (a), but Bishop *Hall* likewise is of the mind, that *το δὲ παλαιόν* is a sure Rule: Let the ancient customs stand: *Every novelty carries his Petition in the face of it* (b).

G 4

It

a Episcopacy not prejudicial, &c. p 99. 100.

b Bishop Hall's Sermon, 2 Sunday Lent, 1641. p. 80.

"It was a good question of the  
 "Church in the *Canticles*, *why should*  
 "I be as one that turns aside to the flocks  
 "of the Companions? It is the great  
 "and glorious stile of God, that in  
 "him is no shadow of changing: Sure-  
 "ly those well settled Churches and States  
 "come nearest to his perfection, that  
 "alter least. But if with *Lipsius*  
 "you say; what if for the better?  
 "I must answer, that in every change  
 "there is a kind of hazard: It is a  
 "wise word therefore of our *Hooker*,  
 "that a tolerable Sore is better than a  
 "dangerous Remedy. And if any one  
 "say these words are not to be exten-  
 "ded to Ceremonies, let him con-  
 "sult a Letter of his to Mr. *Stru-*  
 "thers (c), whom he desires to consi-  
 "der how far it is safe for a parti-  
 "cular Church to depart from the  
 "antient Universal. "Surely no King-  
 "dom can think it a slight matter,  
 "what the Church diffused through  
 "all times and places hath either  
 "done or taught. For Doctrines or  
 "Manners there is no question; and  
 why

a One of  
 the Mini-  
 sters of  
 Edinburgh.

" why should it be more safe to leave  
 " it in the Holy Institutions that con-  
 " cern the outward form of Gods Ser-  
 " vice? *Novelty is a thing full of en-  
 " vy and suspicion*; and why less in  
 " matters of Rite than Doctrine?  
 " True it is, every Nation hath her  
 " own Rites, Gestures, Customs,  
 " and yet there are some wherein  
 " there hath been an Universal Agree-  
 " ment. As every face hath its own  
 " favour, its own lines distinct from  
 " all others, yet is there a certain  
 " common habitude of countenance,  
 " and disposition of the forehead,  
 " eyes, cheeks, lips, common to all.  
 " So as they that under pretence of  
 " difference shall go about to raise  
 " an immunity from such Ceremo-  
 " nies, do no other than argue, that  
 " because there is a diversity of pro-  
 " portion of faces, we may well  
 " want a brow or a chin. He in-  
 " stances in the antient custom of So-  
 " lemn Festivities, and of kneeling at  
 " the Holy Sacrament. By all which  
 " it appears that one may be against a  
 removal

d See c  
 Préface to  
 his fifth  
 part of  
*Revel. Pol.*

removal of the Ceremonies, and yet be no *Hector*, no more than *He*, or Bishop *Sanderſon*, or Mr. *Hooker* (d) were. And theſe men, I muſt tell you, have the leaſt reaſon to complain (or give ſuch Characters as this Apologiſt hath done) of thoſe, whom they call *rigid* or *ſtiff*, *Fathers* or *Sons of the Church of England* (they are his own words, p. 34.) who were ſo unyielding themſelves in every thing which they had a mind to have eſta- bliſhed. Nay, ſome of whom here- tofore were ſo fierce for their own inventions, that every *nicety* ſeemed as if it were a *Fundamental*: and, if King *James* may be believed (e) the *ſmalleſt* *queſtions* about their *Eccleſi- aſtical Diſcipline* raiſed as great *Di- ſputes*, as if the *Holy Trinity* were called in *queſtion*.

e *Raſilicon*  
*Doran* ci-  
 ted in ſe-  
 cond Fair  
*Warning*,  
 cap. 1. p. 8.

X.

It would be only to tire you and my ſelf to proceed any further to anatomize the reſt of this vile Cha- racter; the ſtench of which is al- ready ſo offensive: Nor is there any need



need to spend any more time about it; for the bare reciting of it, will proclaim it to be a Libel, and an infamotis one too; unless you can believe, that *the chiefest Sons of the Church (as they profess themselves) dissent from its Doctrine, transgress its Laws about Rites and Ceremonies, look upon the Archbishops Grindal, Whitgift, and Abbot, as Puritans, and would unbishop some of the present Bishops for Presbyterians.* Who would think that a Book fraught with such language as this, should be commended for a *sober, modest Reply*, by some of chief note among them? Such men would have made excellent *Parasites*, altogether as good as that *Cynathus*, who, when he had spent all other waies of Flattery, praised his Master for his *Tissick*, and said, *he cought very musically.* Their Favourites may say and write what they please, and still maintain the Reputation of godly men; nay, that which in us would be thought a Crime, is commended in one of them-

themselves, as I have formerly shewn  
 you. That very Person who accuses  
 another of writing *Pasquils*, is not  
 afraid to call several of the Bishops  
 (as this man in effect doth some  
 of our *Priests*) *Amaziah-like Priests*,  
*Tyrants*, *rustling*, *ceremonious*, and *vi-*  
*olent Ring-leaders* (f). He declaims  
 also against the Cathedral Service,  
 reproaches the Dignified Clergy, and  
 that after he had confessed in other  
 parts of his Book, the Act of *Indem-*  
*nity* had enjoyned him silence (g).  
 That which is bred in the bone, as we  
 say, will not out of the flesh. This  
 sort of men have ever been wont to  
 revile, and so they cannot forbear it  
 even when they know they should not,  
 and that it is their interest to give  
 good words. And if you will give  
 me leave to speak my judgment free-  
 ly, I think there is also in this ve-  
 ry Writer, a great deal of that  
*Hectorly* swaggering quality, which  
 he unjustly charges others withal.  
 Witness that notable *Vapour*, and  
*High Rant*, page 28. where he tells  
 you

f Anatomie  
 of Dr. G.  
 1660.

g Antidote  
 against  
*Antisobri-*  
*us*, Ofl 30.  
 1660.  
 P. 15. 22,  
 25.

you, the chief Quarrel of the high Hierarchy against the Presbyterian Ministers should in reason have been nothing but this, that *they* (who would have thought it?) were the first in bringing the King back. Which he joyns with a new cluster of calumnies against many of the Bishops, and conforming Clergy: affirming (page 29.) that their own interest, it may be suspected, had a considerable influence into their Loyalty; and that they seem to express more and greater zeal against the *Presbyterians* than against the *Regicides*, &c. Who would not think, that reads this, that they were the men (who but they?) who kept life and heat in the Kings Cause, and that the Episcopal men, many of them, were cold and indifferent? or that they were the *sincere*, the *well-affected* to his Majesty, and the others led by their own interest to follow the *Presbyterian* zeal for him? Nay, that they were the first movers towards the *Kings* Return, even before those that were  
always

always in motion, and never ceased their restless indeavours for it? O most glorious *Apologist*! He may tell us next, as the men of Judah said, *The King is near of kin to us*, for that is as true, as that *they were the first in bringing him back*. If he will stand to this, and not have it pass for a boast, but for a serious Truth; I will produce him the words of some of the heads of his party (which I had rather spare) that make it unlawful to attempt it. Whereby it will appear that they at least were not for bringing him in again, till they were forced to it, by those who would not let them keep him out.

And now that he is in his Throne, methinks it is no great sign of the contentment they take in the change, that the *Conventicles*, which are so frequent and numerous on other dayes, are observed to be so few, if any, upon the day of this Kings Return, or upon the day of the former Kings Death. Look about  
you

you, and consider all the private Meetings you know of on the Lords Day; How many did you ever know or hear of that will vouchsafe at the appointed times to bewail the horrid Murther of the *Father*, or to thank God for the happy Restauration of the *Son*? For my part, I have constantly observed, that those which come within my knowledge, do not assemble on those daies at all; and many others have made the same Observation as well as my self.

As for the other thing, the *Conformists* expressing more and greater Zeal against the *Presbyterians* than against the *Regicides*, and more frequently and more fiercely arraigning and condemning the *Covenant*, than the *Engagement*; the same Answer may serve which Bishop *Sanderfon* gave to those who complained that the *Visitation Sermons* were more against the *Puritans*, than the *Papists* (*g*). First, we say it is not altogether true: the *Regicides* have their share in

g Preface  
to 1 Vol.  
of Sermon.  
Sect. 7. 8.  
1617.

in the Publick Sermons. (of which I suppose he speaks) as well as their Fellows, as oft as the *Text* gives occasion, or the file of their Discourse leads the Preachers to it. And on those Daies I mentioned, it is the General Complaint of your people that the Preachers speak too much against those *King-killers* and those Principles which led them to commit that Sin without Blushing. But, Secondly, admitting it to be true to a tittle, either our men are *excusable* in what they blame them for, or they that blame them *inexcusable*, who do the very same thing. "Do they not usually (saith he) in their Sermons fall bitterly up- on the *Papists* and *Arminians*, but seldome meddle with the *So-* *cinians*, scarce ever name the *Turks*? I have been told often of their Declamations against the ob- serving of *Christmas*, that great superstitious thing, but I remember not to have heard of much spo- ken against *Perjury* and *Sacrilege*, and

"and some other Sins wherewith  
 "four times abound. Nay, did not  
 "their Zeal even against *Papery* it self  
 "seem to abate, when they had  
 "got most of the Pulpits into their  
 "Possession; at leastwise in compa-  
 "rison of the Zeal they shewed  
 "against *Episcopacy*, the *Liturgy*,  
 "*Festivals*, and *Ceremonies* in use  
 "among us? These they cried  
 "down with all the Noise they  
 "could, and with all the Strength  
 "they had: But why I beseech you  
 "so zealous against them, which  
 "were (at the worst they could fan-  
 "sise them) but lesser Sins and Er-  
 "rors in comparison with those  
 "greater which now were little  
 "talkt of? I doubt not but they  
 "had some reasons, wherewith to  
 "satisfie themselves for their so do-  
 "ing; and be they what they will,  
 "if they will serve to excuse them,  
 "they will serve as well to justifie  
 "our men, should they do as they  
 "are charged. The best thing, I  
 "think, that can be alledged by a  
 H rational

"rational man for such a proceed-  
 "ing is this. That where people  
 "are more in danger to be seduced  
 "by a less Error or Sin (as it is  
 "conceived) than a greater, there  
 "more Pains and Zeal may be be-  
 "stowed to keep them from that  
 "than from the other, that is in it  
 "self more dangerous. Thus our  
 "Saviour reproved the *Scribes* and  
 "*Pharisees* more frequently and with  
 "greater sharpness than he did the  
 "*Sadducees*, though in *themselves*,  
 "and in respect of their *Matter*,  
 "the Errors of the *Sadducees* were  
 "worse than those of the other;  
 "because the *Pharisees* by reason of  
 "their outside Holiness were grown  
 "into better esteem with the people  
 "than the *Sadducees* were, and the  
 "generality of the Jews were better  
 "principled against the gross Errors  
 "of the *Sadducees*, than the insna-  
 "ring Doctrines of the hypocritical  
 "*Pharisees*.

All this is very good, and is the  
 very Plea, which those may justly  
 put



put in for themselves who express more and greater zeal against the *Presbyterians* than against the *Regicides*; and arraign the *Covenant* more frequently than the *Engagement*: there is more and greater need of it; the people being in more danger to be misled by the one than by the other; and having a greater abhorrence of those Crimes which are black and ugly, than of those which are gilded over with specious pretences.

But this is not all the *Hectorism* he is guilty of; he makes a large boast of their great indulgence and charity towards Episcopal men when they had power, page 23. and desires me to Catechise my self why I charged them with *rigour and severity* without remembering their kindness to the *Archbishop of Armagh*, and many others, p. 151. I have obeyed him; and for this once shall tell him what my answer is (being ready if he long for it to tell him my mind in all the rest of those Questions.) If I had named

XI.

H 2

their

h Clovi  
Trabales,  
P. 50.

their particular kindnesses to the Episcopal party, I must have remembered how that great person, as Dr. *Bernard* tells us (*h*), was forced to fly from *London* to *Oxford*; what roughness he met withal from the *Army* then in field against the King, to the loss of some of his Books, and principal *Manuscripts* never recovered; how that maintenance was taken from him which had been settled on him by the King when he had lost all *Ireland*; and that at length being necessitated to return to *London*, he was *Silenced* a long time from Preaching, unless in a private house; and when with much ado he was permitted to Preach at *Lincolns-Inn*, it was that Honourable Society which gave him a competent maintenance. Well, but the *English* Bishops, saith the *Apologist*, had *two hundred pound* per annum allowed them by an *Ordinance*. Allowed? Voted he should have said, and that is true; by the same token that they could never get it. Hear Bishop *Hall*, who had a larger portion than that voted him,

him, but, as he himself complains (i), was never the better for it. Nay, the Committee for Sequestrations at London, saith he, sent to the Committee in the Country *an expresse inhibition to pay any such Allowance*; telling them that neither they nor any other Committee had power to allow him *any thing at all*. Nor could he get the fifth part which they said should be allowed his Wife. And, which is worse, they were not ashamed after they had sequestred the Profits of his Bishoprick, sold all his Goods, and Personal Estate (not leaving so much as his Childrens Pictures out of their curious Inventory) (k) to come to him for Assessments and monthly Payments for that Estate which they had taken away; and took distress from him upon his most just denial. Nay, they vehemently required him to find the wonted Arms of his Predecessors, when they had left him nothing, and a little before came and disarmed him. All this was over and above the many insolent affronts put upon

i Special-  
tion of his  
Life writ  
by him-  
self,

k As he  
tells us  
there;  
p. 57.



him all this while, which you may read there if you please, page 62. which made that meek man conclude  
 1 May 19, in these pathetic words (1) : *This*  
 1647. *hath been my measure ; wherefore I know not : Lord, thou knowest, who only canst remedy and end, and forgive or avenge this horrible oppression.*

O but Bishop Morton, adds the Apologist, did get a thousand pound. Right; but when did he get it, and by what means? This Gentleman might seasonably ask himself a cross question, *why he is pleased to remember this kindness, and not withal the rigour that preceded it?* It would not have cost him or his Printer much pains to tell us, his barbarous usage in the Tumults at *Westminster*, when *some* cried, pull him out of his Coach; *others*, nay, he is a good man; *others* again, but for all that he is a Bishop. Which made him often say that he believed he should not have escaped alive, if a leading man among the rabble had not cried out, *Let him go and hang himself* (m). Wonderful civility

Deer  
 Warwick in  
 his Life,  
 p. 103.

civility to such a reverend person! which was attended with ringing of Bells and making Bonfires upon their imprisonment, and with scattering abroad (as Bishop Hall tells us, p. 50.) scurrilous Pamphlets throughout the Kingdom; and in Forein parts, which blazoned their infamy, and exaggerated their treasonable practices. He might have remembred also that after this first imprisonment (which, I gather from Bishop Hall, was from New-years-Eve till Whitsontide) Bishop Morton was committed Prisoner again for six months more to their Serjeant. And what do you think it was for? Only for Baptizing the Child of a Noble Person, according to the order of the Book of Common-Prayer (n). From whence this Gentleman may learn that which it seems he never knew before (as you find page 24.) one that suffered for the use of the Liturgy. By these and such like means the good Bishop was reduced to great straits, and thereupon sued for some maintenance, and by the importunity

tunity of his Friends (which, I must tell you, and nothing else, brought the *Primate* into *Lincolns-Inn*) got the thousand pound this *Apologist* speaks of: not out of the Revenues of his Bishoprick, but out of the Treasury of *Goldsmiths-Hall*, after all his Lands and Revenues were sold. Before this he had no *allowance*, and could not live upon a *Vote* for an annual maintenance, which making no mention by whom nor whence it should be paid (a), was as good as no *Vote* at all. All which considered and many other things of like nature, Dr. *Sanderson* did not stick to write (and I hope he was no Slanderer) that in those days, *They exercised an arbitrary Sovereignty without either Justice or Mercy* (p).

a 1h. page  
124.

Episco-  
pacy not  
prejudici-  
al, &c.  
P. 51.

But was there not a *fifth part*, as the *Apologist* goes on, allowed for the maintenance of the Wife and Children of those Ministers that were ejected? No truly; it was only Voted, but seldom allowed. Bishop *Hall's* Wife, as you heard, could not obtain it;

it; and others also not only went without that allowance, but had better been without the Vote too; which cost them dear, and proved the greatest cruelty. For they spent what they had left for a feeble support, in suing for that which they could never get; and sometimes that which was lent by their Friends was thrown away, by this means, after that which was taken from them. Hear the *History of the English and Scotch Presbytery*, chap. 25 (q).

q Written in French by a Divine of the Reformed Church, translated 1659.

“There is indeed, saith he, an Ordinance of Parliament, that the Wives and Children of ejected Ministers should have the *fifth part* of the Revenues of their Benefices, but it is very ill observed, for the new incumbents refuse to obey the Ordinance, constraining them to plead before Judges, their Adversaries; who instead of speedy relieving them, delay them with length of time, and make them consume in Suits that which they borrowed to plead their cause. By this expence and delays these poor desolate persons are constrained

"stained to desist their prosecution;  
 "and many being ejected out of small  
 "Benefices, dare not present their Pe-  
 "titions for the fifths, because the ex-  
 "pences will amount higher than the  
 "Principal. You may read the rest  
 there if you please, or if you suspect  
 this Author of partiality, you may  
 look into that *Historian* which this  
*Apologist* sometimes cites, Mr. Fuller I  
 mean, who was none of the rigid Sons  
 of the Church, I dare say, in his opi-  
 nion: And he will inform you more  
 distinctly (r), that though the Parlia-  
 ment ordered in the year 1644. that  
 their Commissioners in the Country  
 should appoint means (not exceeding  
 a *fifth part*) to the Wives and Chil-  
 dren of Sequestred persons, yet *Clergy-*  
*men* not being expressed by name, they  
 that enjoyed the Sequestrations refused  
 to contribute to them. The complaints  
 of this begat a new Order of the *House*  
*of Commons*, Die Jovis 11. Novemb.  
 1647. that the *wives* and *Children* of  
 Clergy-men should be comprehended  
 within the Ordinance that allowed the  
*fifth*

7 Book 11.  
 p. 128,  
 &c.



*fifth part for Wives and Children, &c.*

But Covetousness, as he observes, found many little holes to wriggle out at. For if a Minister had a *wife* without *Children*, or *Children* without a *Wife*, or but one *Child*, they denied them payment. Six other evasions besides these he there relates, to which I refer the Reader, by which the intention of the Parliament was deluded, and most of the poor souls who were in want received no benefit of that Ordinance: But rather, as I said, a great deal of mischief; while they were shuffled off with litigious and crafty tricks, and oppressed with charges, when they came to demand that small Alms which was granted them out of their Husbands Estates. What shall I say more? Mr. *Bridges* himself confesses their rigour to the poor Episcopal Clergy; for when the *Converted Gentleman* complains that many Learned, Religious, and Orthodox Divines were plundered, &c. *While their Wives and Children begging their Bread are left to the mercy of those merciless times*; He denies  
not

not a word of it, but answers roundly thus, *There shall be Judgment mercilefs to him that shews no mercy.* 2 Jam. 1. 3. and a little after he repeats it again, *believe it, Sir, you have been bloudily mercilefs, and the just God is now making Inquisition* (1). Nay, it was not the kindness of the *Presbyterian* Ministers that the *Independent* Brethren were suffered; but they sadly complain of it: as you may read in the Petition of the *London* Ministers to the *House of Commons* (2), grounded upon the first *Remonstrance* of the Houses, [wherein they declared it was far from their purpose or desire to let loose the golden Reins of Discipline and Government in the Church, to leave private persons or particular Congregations to take up what Form of Service they please] and upon the *Covenant*, wherein they ingaged themselves to be not only for a full Reformation, but an *Uniformity* in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government. This was received with great Acceptation, and the next year

/ Annotations on  
Loyal  
Convert.  
published  
by Authority.  
1644.  
p. 17.

1 Septemb.  
18, 1644.

year (u) the same Ministers agreed upon a Letter to the *Assembly* against Toleration, in the body of which they expressly call them, *Reasons against the Toleration of Independency in this Church*. The Common Prayer then you may be sure could not be tolerated by their good will, whatever this man sayes; nor were Dr. *Gunning* and the rest suffered at *London* and *Oxford*, till their Power was out of Doors. Whilst the Covenant was in Credit, it was severely forbid, and the King himself, had it been in their power, should not have had the privilege to use it. This Covenant also, though he would have us believe the contrary, was prest with great Rigour. Look into our Church, saith Bishop *Bramhall*, (x) and see how many of our principal Divines have lost their Dignities and Benefices, only because they would not take a Schismatical Covenant, without any other relation to the Wars. I have read of a thousand imprisoned and sequestred

u Decemb.  
13, 1645

x Replication to  
Bishop of  
Chalcedon.  
p. 40.

First  
Discovery,  
Dec. 1646.  
Sect. 3.

sequestred upon this score, and near  
an hundred Fellows of Colledges in  
one Week banished Cambridge for  
refusing it. Nay, the Houses were  
so impartial (they are the express  
words of Mr. Pryn) (y) in the pre-  
scription of it, that such Members  
of the Lords or Commons that did but  
scruple the taking of it, were suspen-  
ded the Houses till they did conform.  
Upon which ground he shews how  
unequal it was that any man should be  
priviledg'd and exempted from it. And  
therefore I do not believe, that many  
of the Episcopal Perswasion were suffered  
to enjoy places in the Churches, Col-  
ledges, and Schools without ever taking  
the Covenant (as this Apologist affirms,  
p. 23.) unless he means, after it was  
laid aside, and the Sectaries (as they  
then spoke) not only obstinately re-  
fused it, but openly oppugned and de-  
rided it, nay, framed an *Anticovenant*  
against it in their private Congrega-  
tions (z). But it is no wonder he  
should write thus confidently, when  
Mr. R. Bailly had the face to write,

Mr. Pryn  
is.

not-

notwithstanding all this, that the Covenant was so far from being urged by fear of unjust suffering, that to this day it could never be obtain'd from the Parliament of *England* to enjoin that Covenant upon any by the penalty of a *two-pence* (a). No indeed, what need that? when the terms were, *take it, or lose your Benefice*. Just such another vapour he made (for these men are much given to it) in another place, affirming in a Sermon at the *Hague*, that not any thing had hitherto been objected against the Covenant. What could be more impudently spoken, when the Reasons of the University of *Oxford* had been published against it several years before; and testified the bold falshood of what he saith also in his Epistle before the Review (where he would qualifie the business a little) that to this day no man has shew'd any error in the matter of that Covenant? And indeed shew what we will, it is all one, they will not regard it. They still retain, I see by this man, a wonderful affection for the Covenant, and cannot

a Review  
of the Fair  
Warning.  
p. 80.

cannot endure it should bear any blame. *It was not*, saith he, *the Cause of the War*. Why so? *the Battel at Edgehil being fought before the Covenant came into England*, p. 22. what of all that? The Covenant might notwithstanding be a great cause of the War, and I will prove it had a great hand in it. All the stirs in Scotland were by the means of it; they entring into it without the Kings consent; obtruding (b) it with *threatning, beating, tearing* of Cloaths; *turning* men out of their Livings, *Excommunicating, Processing* those that would not subscribe it; and binding themselves to a mutual assistance against all persons whatsoever. Upon which the Kings Commissioner desired that they would add [*Except the King and his Successors*] but they refused it, and in their explication of the Covenant, which came out afterward, would add no such thing, but only that *they would defend his Person and Authority in the Preservation and Defence of true Religion* (c). In that form it marched

b Large  
Declarati-  
on, p. 75  
199.

c Ib. p. 107,  
109.

marched into *England* (d); whither the Spirit of it was come before, and had raised those Arms which might have been soon laid aside again, had it not been for the Covenant. For without the assistance of the *Scots*, the Parliament of *England* knew not how to carry on the War, and without the Covenant came along with them, or march'd before them, they would not jog, or stir a foot: As appears by this Relation, which I find in the *Second Fair Warning* (e), sent from one well acquainted with the Affairs of his own Country. When the Commissioners, saith he, came down into *Scotland* from the Parliament of *England*, and a Letter they brought was read in the Assembly there, they received no other Answer but this: *Gentlemen, we are sorry for your case; but whereas your Letter saith you fight for Defence of the Reformed Religion, you must not think us blind, that we see not your fighting to be for civil disputes of the Law, which we are not acquainted withal. Go home, and*

d What use the Army made of the clause, the Remonstrance about the Treaty at the Isle of Wight will tell you.

e By Rich. Watson, 1651, p. 178, 179.

reconcile with the King: He is a gracious Prince, and will receive you to his Favour. You cannot say it is for the Reformed Religion, since you have not begun to reform your Church. You had thriven better if you had done as we did, begun at the Church. "A  
"few days after this, new Addres-  
"ses being made, their Friends in  
"the Assembly made this proposition, Will you joyn in Covenant with us  
"to reform Doctrine and Discipline  
"conform to this of Scotland? and ye  
"shall have a better answer. The Re-  
"ply was, thanks, and that they  
"would represent their desires to the  
"Parliament from whom they had no  
"instructions for such an agreement.  
"Nay, said the Assembly again, this  
"will be loss of time, and the danger  
"is great, the Parliament not being  
"able with all their forces to stand  
"two months before the King; we  
"will rather therefore draw up the  
"Solemn League and Covenant here,  
"and send up with you some Noble-  
"men, Gentlemen, and Ministers that  
"shall



“shall see it subscribed: which was  
 “accordingly done. The *Covenant*  
 was cried up, the *Scots* came into  
*England*, and what did they come for?  
 It was, saith the Preface to Mr. *Knox*  
 his History to fight the Battels of the  
*Lord*, i. e. to pull down *Episcopacy*  
 and to set up *Presbytery* in its room,  
 according to the *Covenant*: which  
*League and Covenant*, saith Mr. *Ru-*  
*therford*, was the first foundation of the  
 ruine of the Malignant party in Eng-  
 land (f), but not of *Episcopacy*, this  
 Gentleman would have you believe;  
 for it was declared in the Assembly that  
 the *Covenant* did not bind against a *Pr-*  
*imitive Episcopacy*, page 31. What  
 they mean by a *Primitive Episcopacy* I  
 will not stand to enquire; but this is  
 well known, that the *Three Ministers*  
 in their first answer to the Divines of  
*Aberdeen*, positively affirmed, That  
*Episcopacy* was not abjured by their Con-  
 fession nor their *Covenant* (g); which  
 was averred by many other *Covenant-*  
 ers to those who otherways scrupled  
 to enter into their *Covenant*. And I

f See *Tol-*  
*eration*  
*Discus'd*,  
 p. 147.

g See *Large*  
*Declara-*  
*tion*, p. 117.

know that some declared the same in *England*; and yet notwithstanding nothing would satisfie but the extirpation of Episcopal power, and they laboured tooth and nail to settle the Government by Presbyters alone. This the people thought was the great end of the Covenant, and there is no doubt but the scope of the first contrivers of it was to destroy *Episcopacy* root and branch. This was their first work after the War was begun, to send a Commissioner to the *English* Parliament, 1642. to move them to cast out Bishops, [not a word of limiting them] and others to the King at *Oxford* to sign all propositions; which because he would not do, they resolve to assist their Brethren against him, under the name of the *Common Enemy* (h). But before they came, they told the Commissioners of Parliament, as I shew'd you, they must covenant to reform *Doctrine and Discipline conform to Scotland*. And accordingly, the same Author informs me that, their Covenant came into *England* with such a clause as this, *we shall reform*

h Second  
Fair it's a n-  
ing, p. 185.

reform our Church in Doctrine and Discipline conform to the Church of Scotland (i) of which the Independent Brethren cheated them, making that be razed out, and those words inserted which we now read in it. However the abolition of the Office of Bishops was their great demand of the King, as Mr. R. Bailly expressly affirms: adding that the unhappy Prelates had found it to be their great demand from the beginning of our troubles unto this day (k.) And he plainly affirms that to deny them this satisfaction, was to conclude that the King himself and all his Family, and three Kingdoms should perish. Why so I beseech you? It could not be otherwise, notwithstanding all their fine words in the beginning, for they had sworn to root them out; and could not break their Covenant to save three Kingdoms. And therefore at last Mr. Bailly perswades himself, the King did consent to abolish Name and Thing not only for three years but for ever. Strange! when his Majesty had so often clearly protested that he could not with a good

k Review  
of fair  
warning,  
1649  
chap. 12.  
p. 76.

*Conscience consent to it. Did they force him at last to do it against his Conscience, or did they give him such satisfaction that he saw at last he might safely do it? Alas! we dull souls do not understand the mysteries which they can find in words. His Majesty consented to lay aside Bishops for three years, till he and his Parliament should agree upon some settled Order for the Church. Now this, saith he, was tantamount to for ever: it being supposed (mark the jugling) that they can never agree to admit Episcopacy again. Why so? For all and*  
*every one (saith he) (1) in both Houses*  
*last, p. 81. having abjured Episcopacy by solemn Oath and Covenant (observe that) the Parliament could not agree with the King to erect the fallen Chairs of the Bishops; so there remained no other, but that either his Majesty should come over to their Judgment, or by his not agreeing with them, yet really to agree in the perpetual abolition of Episcopacy, since he had granted to lay aside Bishops till he and his Houses had agreed upon a settled Order in the Church. This was an admirable*

mirable contrivance, especially if you call to mind, as the Answer tells him, how there was something else agreed, *viz.* that twenty Divines of his Majesties nomination being added to the Assembly should have a free consultation and debate about the settlement of Church-Government after those three years or sooner, if differences could be composed. A very *free Debate* this was like to be, in which all Reasons that could be given for Episcopacy were shut out of doors, and concluded by an *Oath* to be put to silence. But why should I trouble myself any farther? The wider indeed the hole grows in the mill-stone, the clearer a man may see through it; but this mans Sophistry is visible enough already: nor needs there more words to shew that this modest *Braggadocio* vaunts himself ridiculously in the merits of his party; and that Mr. *Vicars* and such like were not the only men that reviled and calumniated. They that pretend to *humility, modesty, and seriousness* cannot forbear it.

Y.H.

p. 92. 93.  
137.

m p. 35.

a Review,  
p. 48.

But if you desire a farther taste of his Spirit, I pray have so much patience as to hear how he uses me. In the *Preface* he accuses me of *railing*, and in his Book (p. 2.) of *reviling*; without taking notice of one word that I have said in answer to these calumnies. They are resolved I see to be confident, and to have their saying, do, or say we what we can. For he tells you also of my *jeering*, *scolding*, *false accusation*, and *mocking*; *lightness* and *drollery*; but not a syllable to make good the charge. No, that was a hard thing, but very easie to say that I write sometime, what might better become some *Ecclesiastical Hudibras*, or a *Doctor of the Stage*, than (m) &c. Just thus Mr. R. Baily was pleased to answer that excellent Bishop, which this man commends, Dr. Bramhall. Concerning the 8th. Chapter of whose *Fair Warning*, he saith, it much better beseemed a *Mercurius Aulicus* than either a *Warner* or a *Prelate* (n). He charges him also with gathering together an *heap of Calumnies*, &c. though, as the Reply tells

tells him, that heap was nothing else but a faithful Collection of Historical Narrations, which require not the credulity of the simple, but the search of diligent people, if they distrust them. The same I say for my self; they must be beholden to a new light, which nobody can see but themselves, to make Historical truth to be a slander. They are fain to call it so, because they *cannot* tell how to answer it otherways, and they will not lay their hands on their mouths. If better were within, better would come out: they are fain to throw out such words, because they want a substantial Apology. The same Mr. *Baily*, I remember charges, the strength of one of the Bishops Reasons to be *black Atheism and much worse than Pagan Scepticism* (o). By o lb. 19. which you may see it is their manner to censure boldly, and tumble out frightful words, without regard to Truth. For if you would know what Doctrine it is, which he calls by the name of *Brutish and Atheistical Maxims* (that's another of his civil words,

words, p. 90 ) it is this. *That it is not lawful for Subjects to plant that which they apprehend to be true Religion by force of Arms: nor to take up Arms against their Prince merely for Religion.* This was all the Bishop had said, and not without great reason. But they are *Brutes* or *Atheists*, divested of all *Reason* or *Religion*, who prefer not their *Enthusiastical Heats* before the most sober and wise *Resolutions*. They, as the Bishop speaks in the end of that Treatise, are more ridiculously partial than the men of *China*; for they talk as if *they* only had two eyes and all the rest of the world were stark blind.

- XIII. So one would think this Apologist supposed, when he thought to put us off with such a wretched Reply to what was objected from the Practices of the *Old Nonconformists*: who being silenced forbore to preach, and justified their silence against the *Brownists*, who accused them



them for their submission to the Ecclesiastical Censures. His Answer is, *That the Number of the ejected Ministers then, was not comparable to what it is now.* p. 6. Which is just like the Exposition, which they sometime gave of that Scripture. *Rom. 13. 1. I conceive, saith one, (p) that those Christians who lived under the Heathenish Emperours, but wanted strength to defend themselves, were by that precept, [let every soul be subject to the higher powers] obliged to sit still, and to endeavour nothing against those that had the sword in their hands. For it would have discovered them to be of unruly Spirits, in that they proceeded wholly according to passion, and not according to sober judgment. So that there was nothing of Christian Virtue in their subjection, but only of humane Prudence; and no great store of that was necessary, for they had been arrant fools if they had made a stir when they knew they could do nothing. It is not want of will, it seems, but want of strength that keeps these men from break-*

Nathaniel  
Dowry.  
1652. p. 37.

q In the  
Continuati-  
on. Edit.  
1. 345.

r An. 1609.  
p. 16. 31.

breaking those Laws that restrain them. The old Nonconformists, he would have you think, would have done as they do now, had they been as numerous: Then they would have entered into strong Combinations, and slighted that Authority to which they submitted. But weigh their Reasons, which I alledged (q) and shall not now repeat, and you will see he casts a blot on them as well as us; for they are such as will shut up the mouths of a *great many* as well as a *few*. But how *few* were they in those daies, do you think, that were ejected? He tells you *usually not one to one hundred, to what it is in our daies*. Ib. It is notably guessed *by instinct*, for, I dare say, he hath no Author to warrant his Assertion; and for once (as the fore-named Bishop speaks in another case) his instinct hath deceived him. According to the computation of *Philagathus*, there should not at this rate be *five and twenty* in all the Kingdome; whereas the Humble Supplication in King *James* his time. (r) talks of sharp-  
nels

"ness and rigour for the silencing and  
 "removing of *no mean number* of the  
 "worthiest Pastors in the Land: in-  
 "somuch that the ordinary means of  
 "Conversion from blindness and infi-  
 "delity was interrupted and crossed,  
 "in that *so many* worthy Lights had  
 "been by the Prelates removed from  
 "shining in the Church. Nay, one  
 would think by their words, that all  
 who were good for any thing were si-  
 lenced, for they say, *p. 25.* in an in-  
 definite manner, "The faithful Mini-  
 "sters of the Gospel are in all disgra-  
 "cive and unworthy sort discarded,  
 "and removed from being any longer  
 "the Lords Sentinels and Watchmen.  
 Which they repeat again, *p. 28.* And  
 the *Defence of the Ministers Reasons*  
 for refusal of Subscription (*s*) tells *f* Preface,  
 you of *so many* turned out from that *1607.*  
 high and heavenly calling, that for any  
 means of maintenance left to *many* of  
 them, they may seek their bread. Here  
 is such a many, that being divided into  
 two parts, rich and poor, one of them  
 makes a *many*; and therefore the whole  
 was

Between  
a Nether-  
lander and  
English-  
man.

a Regi-  
ment of  
the church.  
Chap. 5.

was a *great many*, not a few, as this man affirms. Nay, by that time the War was begun, there was none of the best sort of Ministers left, if we will believe the *Dialogue* I mention-  
ed; (t) which saith, the Bishops had stript *all the Assemblies* of their *faith-  
fullest* Preachers. In this stile they were wont to speak then, as they do now; though I have reason to think that some of these *faithfullest* Preachers and *watchmen* stood more upon their Credit, than any thing else when they refused Subscription. For I find it recorded above 60 years ago by Mr. *The. Bell* (u), that he discoursing with a Preacher about the *Canons* just then made, 1604. (against which he could alledg nothing of moment) was told by him that he would neither lose his living, nor yet conform to those Orders. And when he demanded how that could be, was answered, that *he would have one to do it, but not do it himself*. And again, being told he might as lawfully do it himself, as procure another to do it, uttered these words, *How*

can

can I do that against which I have so often preached? which, saith Mr. Bell, I told him savoured of the Spirit of the proud Pharisee, not of the humble Publican. I thought indeed before that all their Proceedings had been out of mere Conscience, which now I perceive to be of Pride in a great many of them: through which manner of dealing the simpler sort become disobedient, and are deeply drowned in Error; and our Church pitifully tormented with Schisms and dissention. Honest Bernard Gilpin (x) was of another mind; who being called to subscription in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, though dissatisfied in two points of the Articles of smaller consequence, yet, subscribed to them, *least*, thought he with himself, *if I shall refuse, I shall be a means to make many others to refuse, and so consequently hinder the course of the word of God.*

But perhaps you desire to know the precise Number which were then ejected; and if you give Credit to one of your own Authors, this man is much out of the way, for the *Altar*  
of

x See his  
Life. p.  
132. 133.

of Damascus affirms, that there were either silenced or deprived upon the account of not conforming three hundred preaching Ministers. Dr. *Hoylyn* indeed informs me that it doth not appear upon the Rolls that there were above nine and forty deprived upon all occasions, till the death of Archbishop *Bancroft*, and so the whole Number of the silenced and deprived might not be so great as they pretended. You must conclude one of these two things; either that they loved then when occasion served to make a Mountain of a Mole-hill; or now they are desirous to do the just contrary, and depress their Number to little or nothing. And in like manner *now* he tells us the people dissatisfied with the *Liturgy* or *Ceremonies* are ten if not an hundred to one to what they were formerly; and yet *then* they talkt of *many thousands* (2) of the most loyal and best affected Subjects that joyned with them in their Affection to the desired Reformation.

That

Hamble  
Supplication. p. 36.

That is, they talk boldly and at random out of their own imaginations, as if they wrote to simple deacons that believe every word without chewing. Otherwise this Apologist would not have told us that *Mr. Hildersham was silenced but in some Dioceses, &c.* p. 7. whereas *Mr. Clark* tells us expressly that he was not onely silenced, but deprived for refusing of Subscription, 1605. and was not allowed to preach till 1608. and within less then a year silenced again, and continued so *a long time*. Nay, was judicially admonished in the High Commission, (22 April 1613) and enjoyned that "saving the Catechising of his own family, he should not at *any time* hereafter preach, catechise, or use *any part* of the Office or Function of a Minister either *privately* or *publikely* until he was restored, &c. And that it was not till 1625 that he was licensed to preach in some Dioceses. How

K it

it was with others, I have not had occasion to observe, and now have not leisure to examine; but have cause from this to suspect that he doth not report these matters clearly and with sincerity.

- XIV. And indeed, overweening of mens selves is apt to blinde them, and makethem imagine any thing will pass for truth and for sound reason which comes out of their mouthes. One would wonder what he thinks our brains are made of, who puts us off with such slender stuff as this, for an excuse of their holding Meeting separate from us. *It is no schisme, nor a breach of the unity of the Church, because they take occasion to meet for a time onely; till a door be opened for them in the Church, by the removal of some supposed or real corruption in the public Worship.* As if there were no breach in a garment when it is rent, because it may be sowed together



gether again. But yet this the *Apologist* thinks, makes the *Separation* of the *Nonconformists* from the Church of *England*, not *total* and *perpetual*, p. 111. which he repeats again, p. 128. and calls it a *temporary and partial withdrawing*. A very sorry employment this is, for a Divine (as I take him to be) to spend his time in sowing a few fig-leaves together to cover the shame of a sinful disobedience to their Governours, and the great breach they have made in the unity of the Church. For it may be demonstrated from his own words that this is a meer shift and frivolous excuse. He confesses a *Separation*; onely he addes that it is but temporary. The cause of this *temporary Separation* is a *supposed or real corruption in the publike Worship*. I ask now, Is this corruption such (whether real or supposed) that it is a just cause for a Separation? If it be not, they ought not to withdraw

themselves for a time. If it be, they may withdraw themselves from us alway. And so they will according to these Principles: for if this corruption be not removed, they must alway continue separated, or else it is no sufficient reason for separating now. Do what they can, they are not like the old Nonconformists; for they did not withdraw themselves into separate bodies, no not for a time. If they had upon his Principles, they must have died *Separatists* (there being no removal of what they wished taken out of the way) as these men are like to do, unless they repent and alter their practices, in stead of desiring an alteration in the Publick Worship. Besides, he is very ignorant of the state of our affairs, who doth not know it hath been the manner of this Sect to proceed from evil to worse since the very beginning of it: which makes me think it past doubt that they will settle in a down-

down-right Separation. At the first they onely disliked some Ceremonies, and could pretty well digest coasformity in the rest. In a hute time they manifested a dislike of Episcopal Government, being better affected to the doctrine of Mr. Calvin: and together with that, they distasted also our Common prayer. From a dislike some proceeded to think them unlawful, and then fell into a contempt of *Bishops* and the *Prayer*, bitterly rayling against them. From hence they advanced to open disobedience to all the Orders of the Church, and at last renounced it, and rent themselves from it, esteeming themselves the onely Brethren and Congregation of the Faithful. Some there were indeed that did not go thus far; and being silenced or deprived for not conforming to the Ceremonies, would not separate from the Church, nor refused to joyn with our Assemblies. This Apologist

See the Visitation  
on speech  
at Lisne-  
garvy.  
p. 5.

would have us think that he and his Brethren are the followers of those : and yet confesses they are gone a large step beyond them, having *separated for a time*. And the same reason which hath carried them thus far, will advance them further, and make that *time* so long, that it will prove *always*. They will teach next, that *God's people must be Separatists (a)*. In order to which *we must be, that part of the kingdom which is the world, and not the Church of Christ (b)*. And still they will have a further journey to go, and never rest till they be uppermost, and have set *Jesus Christ*, that is themselves, upon his throne. What ground any man can have to hope any better, I cannot imagine : they being so bent to defend their present unwarrantable practices, that they will flie to any refuge, though never so dangerous ; nay, take sanctuary in shadows, and think they are safe, rather then yield the

*a* Protestation  
protested,  
1641.

*b* Groans  
for Liberty,  
1646

the cause. An instance of which you have in this Writer, who immediately after that which was now noted, alledges the words of a *Romish* Doctor mentioned by Bishop *Trambal*, to excuse them from Schism, p. 12. But let any man consult the place, and he will find presently they are nothing to the business. For the Bishop is there speaking (c) onely concerning clashings between Bishops and Churches, long and resolutely maintained, which he shows may be so managed as not to be Schism. But he expressly determines a little after, p. 23. that it is schism to separate from other Christians without sufficient ground in the participation of the same Sacraments, or in the use of the same Divine Offices and Liturgies of the Church, and publique Worship and Service of Almighty God, or of the same common Rites & Ceremonies, &c. The very same he declares elsewhere, that they who break the unity of

c Vindice  
of the  
Church  
of Engl.  
p. 7.

132 *An Appendix to the third Part*

*the Church for difference in indifferent rites, are guilty of Schism (d) and that most of the Schisms in the Church of Christ have been about the Canons of the Church, and not the substantials of Religion.* Among other instances, he mentions the Schisms raised in our Church about a Surplice, signe of the Cross, &c. If therefore this *Apologist* would have done like a man, he should have shewn that we obtrude *sinful Rites* as a condition of Communion with us; and so by this *Bishops* confession are guilty of making the Schism our selves. And he should, in order to this, have clearly answered all that hath been said in defence of our Church; and especially the Arguments of their Fore-fathers the old *Nonconformists*, who proved against the *Brownists* that there was no such corruption in our Church, as was a sufficient ground of separation from it. Here was the very point, if he  
durst

*Replic.*  
to Bishop  
of Chal-  
cedon, p.  
79, 80.

durst have toucht it, or come near it. Which since he hath not done, but spent his time in impertinent things, I must leave him to the favourable censure of S. Austin, mentioned somewhere by the same Bishop in another case; *They cannot do better in a bad cause; but who constrained them to have a bad cause?*

This was it which made him turn his back so often upon the Question; and to make a Book which one cannot resemble more fully then to a Winter-torrent, which abounds with water when there is no need of it; but in Summer, when it should be useful, it is dried up. (They are the words of the fore-mentioned Bishop, which I thought good to use, since he doth so, even when he doth not name him.) Such is this Apologie, full of proofs where there is no controversie between us; and where the water sticks indeed, he

XV.

is

is as mute as a fish. There is no question, for instance, but we may use the words of Scripture by way of *accommodation*: no body denies it; and that which he cites to this purpose out of one of our Bishops, I observed long before he told me of it, (p. 54, 87.) But then we ought to say that we use them so; and not talk as if that were the genuine sense of the Divine Writ, never acquainting the people with any other. And you ought not to pretend to more than other men, who can do this as well as your selves; unless you had the very same *spirit and power* which the Apostles had. Nor is it the Question whether mens affections are raised with *Novelty and Variety* (p. 59.) but whether those be the best affections which are raised by that means, or those which are raised by serious consideration and laying to heart of the same things in the same words. All that he alledges out of Mr.

Hol-



Hollingworth, p. 56. is to no purpose; for I have proved that the Nonconformists pretend to more; even the very same that Mr. Baily did in his Answer (e) to Bishop *Review*  
*Bramhal's* Fair warning, who *chap. 12.*  
would have the people endeavour *P. 75.*

to attain a readiness to pray in their family out of their own heart, in the words which Gods Spirit dytes to them. But as that Bishop said elsewhere, this man doth not seek the Question in earnest, but as he who sought for the Hare under the Leads, because he must seek her as well where she was not, as where she was. Else he would not have askt the Question, *Whether Nonconformist Ministers seek after Visions and Revelations*, p. 68. That is not the point: but whether Mr. W.B. have not taught the people to do so. He might have added, if he had pleased, Whether they have not pretended to them. And an History in one of our Chronicles would have taught him

him to answer affirmatively. For there was a Physician in Oxford, one *Rich: Haidock* of New-Colledge, who pretended to preach in his sleep, in such sort, that though he was call'd upon aloud, or stirr'd, or pull'd by hands or feet, he would make no shew of hearing or feeling. His fame was spread abroad by the name of the *sleeping Preacher*; so that he was brought to Court, and one night his Majesty (f) being present to attend the event, the Gentleman began to pray, and then took a Text, made his Division, applyed it to his purpose, which was to inveigh against the Pope, the Cross in Baptism, and the Canons then newly made. And yet all this was a meer cheat, as he confessed afterwards to the King; who pardoned him on condition that he should openly in all places acknowledge his offence, because many, saith the Historian, were brought to believe that his nightly preaching was either

f. See Sir  
*Ric: Baker*  
in the 3d  
year of  
*K. James*

by inspiration or by vision. This may serve to requite his impertinent tale, for which there was no occasion, about a Ministers praying that they might have *godly dreams*.

Again; they are not accused for being time-servers now, (as he supposes, p. 89.) but heretofore. And in this, that excellent person *Bishop Sanderson* (with whom he may engage, if he please, now he is dead) will bear me out, that it is no false accusation. I will recite his words, and briefly prove the truth of them where it is needful. Before the beginning of the *Long Parliament*, and the unhappy divisions which followed thereupon, there were few (saith he) either of the Ministers that scrupled to use the Cross, or of the people that took offence at it (g). Which words asg Preface to Clavi Travales Aug. 1661. to the Ministers, on whom the people depended, may be justified from the Registers of Subscriptions, in which we finde the most eminent

minent men of your way subscribed *libenter & ex animo*, freely & heartily, to the three Articles mentioned in the 36 Canon. Among the rest, Mr. Calamy (whom our Apologist mentions with the titles of *Discreet, honest, pious Mr. Calamy*, p. 92.) Nov. 9. 1637. and Mr. Jenkyn, Jan. 2. 1640. And if you look as far back as 1627. you will finde Mr. Hugh Peters himself subscribing to the very height. As for the *Archbishops & Bishops*, he saith, I acknowledg their *Offices and Jurisdictions*, and cannot see but there would a *fearful Ataxy* follow without the present Government, whereof I so approve, that I have and willingly do submit to it and them, *and have and will press the same upon others* (h). As for the *Ceremonies*, he saith, I shall diligently and daily practise them, neither have I ever been accused of neglect therein where I have formerly exercised my Ministry, but do give to them *my full approbation*.

Subscription before the Bishop of London, Aug. 17. the original whereof found under his hand in the Arch-Bishops Study by Mr Prym, and published in his *Fresh discovery*, 1646. Sect. 8.

probation and allowance. Lastly, for the Book of Common-prayer, the Liturgie of the Church, and what is in them contained, (*finding them agreeable unto the Word of God*) I have used as other Ministers have done, and am resolved so to do, &c. And to these, *I subscribe with my heart and hand.* What it was that altered his mind or his practice afterward, I have nothing to do with: but so it was, (as the Bishop proceeds) that when after the beginning of the Parliament all things were let loose in the Church, the greatest part of the Clergie (to their shame be it spoken) many for fear of loosing their Livings, more in hope to get other mens Livings, and some possibly out of their simplicity beguiled with the specious name of Reformation, in a short space became either such perfect time-servers as to *cry down*, or such tame compliers with the stronger side, as to *lay down*, ere they needed, the

the use of the whole Liturgie, and of all the Rites and Ceremonies therein prescribed. But the Cross above all was anathematiz'd and bitterly inveighed against, as it is even at this day by the Managers of the Presbyterian interest, *&c.* who having engaged to plead in the behalf of other mens tender Consciences, do wisely consider  
 "wical, that it will not be so  
 "much for their own *credit* now  
 "to become time-servers *with the*  
 "*Laws*, as it was some years past  
 "for their *profit*, to become time-  
 "servers *against the Laws*.

If he desire any more on this subject, let him call for it, and I shall not be sparing of my pains to serve him. But let him be sure, if he make a *new Catechism*, to put his Questions better. For in this he eats up the true Question (as was said long ago) in stead of answering the Quære; as the Cuc-koe is said to suck up the Sparrows egge, and lay another of  
 her

her own in the room. I did not charge them with holding it unlawful to keep Festival days, (as he states it, p. 43, 44.) but with not keeping ours, since they cannot deny it to be lawful, and keep others of their own. Nor found fault with the saying *Well through mercy* (p. 102.) but their using new distinguishing forms of speech. Nor, with their not condemning *Sacrilege* as a sin, but their not speaking and writing against it when there was such occasion for it. This I have told him already in the *Third Part* of the Debate, if he would have vouchsafed to peruse it, before he said any thing of it: and I shall now tell him once more, that they were wittily compared by a great person (i) whom he commends, to; Bishop the two *Sicilian* Gluttons, who blew *Bramhal* their noses in the dishes, that they *Schism* might devour the meat alone: that guarded, p. 112. they cryed down the Bishops revenues as dangerous, and nourishers

L

shers

shers of pride and laziness, because  
 they gaped after them themselves.  
 No body questions this, but they  
 would have had them applyed  
 to their maintenance. That  
 which they are charged withal is,  
 that after all that gaping, they shut  
 their mouthes, and would not o-  
 pen them to declare against the  
 alienation of the Church-lands,  
 which was then in hand. Yes,  
 (saith this Writer, p. 15.) *the As-  
 sembly did dare to condemn Sacri-  
 ledge as a sin against the second  
 Commandment in their larger Cate-  
 chism, for which they cite the  
 Scriptures.* I told you as much;  
 but this is not the business: nay,  
 more then this, I have shew'd you  
 they believed not onely Sacriledge  
 to be a sin; but the alienation of  
 our Church-lands, as things then  
 stood, to be *Sacriledge* (k). And  
 yet they did not plainly declare  
 against that fact; much less made  
 such declarations as they did a-  
 gainst other sins in the Pulpit, and

& Third  
 part of  
 Debate,  
 p. 207.



Is they require us to make in the like case, or else think us negligent. None of them did like Mr. *Udal* whom I mentioned, or like Mr. *Bernard Gilpin* in the last year of *King Edward* (1) or like Archbi-<sup>1 Sermon at Court 1552, first Sunday after Epipha-</sup>shop *Whitgift*, whose affectionate Speech on this subject to *Queen Elizabeth*, mixed with great humi-<sup>70, 71, 72, &c.</sup>lility and reverence, is recorded by a worthy Gentleman, Mr. *Isaac Walton*, in the Life of our incomparable *Hooker* (m). The truth is, men of the greatest temper, wisdom and piety have noted this inequality of zeal in this party about suchlike matters as this, long before I was born: and therefore thought not to be censured as such a piece of uncharitableness in me to mention it. Dr. *Jackson*, for instance, in his Treatise of *Justifying faith* (n), tells us, that the first ground of his dislike unto the chief solicitors of Reformation in our Church, (though he always revered their excellent Parts

and good Labours) was the difformity of their Zeal. For had it been uniform, saith he, no question but it would have moved them to lay down their lives for the redressing KNOWN ENORMITIES in the Common wealth; as much more material, and more nearly concerning the advancement of the Gospel, then those doubtful Controversies of Formalities, about which they strove, as death it self is more terrible then deprivation. The principal Authors and Abettors of which Enormities, notwithstanding were emboldned by these Encomiasts, in whose language every Cormorant that would countenance their Cause, was a sanctified person, and a son of God. He may call this railing perhaps the next time he writes; if not, he must excuse me from it, who have writ nothing severer then this.

But it may be further added, that the Catechism he mentions, did not come forth till the business

ness was too far gone; and whatsoever had been said then, would but have been to shut the Stable-door, when the Steed was stoln. For the Ordinance for abolishing Archbishops and Bishops, and settling their Lands and Possessions upon Trustees for the use of the Common-wealth, was made *October* 9. 1646. And that for settling their Lands, *November* 16 following: whereas the larger Catechism was not printed till *October* 22. 1647, and then no more then six hundred Copies onely for the use of the Houses and the Assembly, to the end they might advise thereupon. More then this, the Scriptures were added afterward, and came not forth with the first Edition; and *lastly*, they make mention also there of *Perjury*; and yet there was no Preaching against it, till the Covenant came to be broken, though it was a sin before that time wherewith the Land abounded.

As for the *Authors* of the *Annotations*, I know them not; and what he alledges concerning the additions to them 1651, it is nothing to the point. It was then too late, and the case was altered. The rest of the maintenance of the Clergy was in danger, the very Tythes being envied to them; which made it high time to say something to keep themselves from being undone, after they had ruined the Bishops.

XVI. But it would be endless to follow this man in his vagaries, and an employment more tedious and irksome, than *Phocion's* in chipping *Demosthenes*, to pare off all in his Book that is not to the purpose. Should I undertake it, his Apology would remain a very slender tool, not worth a straw.

For setting aside his calumnies; his unjust complaints of railing, jeering, and what not? his falsities boldly asserted, his mistakes  
of

of the Question; his impertinent allegation of Authorities; his idle stories, frivolous observations, uncharitable surmises, and odious insinuations; his mis-representing of my words, his cropping or enlarging them; his false glosses and commentaries, and suchlike things; I can finde very little that looks like so much as an endeavour of a *direct Answer*. If you be not weary, I pray observe a few things on some of those Heads. What a frivolous observation is that out of the *Rhemish Testament*, about the retaining of old words; which you may read in him, if you will, (p. 42.) for I shall not stand to recite it? There being nothing plainer, then that neither they nor we refuse to use the words *Amen, Fasting, Charity, the blessed Sacrament, Alleluja*, and others there mentioned, and yet are in no danger to believe as the Church of *Rome* doth; nor should we, though we should use the

words *Altar, Oblation and Sacrifice*, as well as *Lent, Palm Sunday* and *Christmas*. And what do you think of the tale of the Citizen or Countryman (he knows not which) who being askt his opinion of a Sermon, said it ran or sounded thus, as if he had said, *A pudding, a pye, a pudding-pye; a pudding for me, a pye for thee, a pudding-pye for me and thee?* p.65. This is the man that makes *serious reflections* upon the Debate; just like the *serious* prayer of one of their present Preachers, who in the presence of a numerous Auditory, used these words to God, which sound more like that Ryme than any Sermon that ever I heard. *Thou art the hope of our help, and the help of our hope; thou art our hope when we have no help, and thou art our help when we have no hope; yea, thou art our hope and our help, when we have neither hope nor help, but are helplese and hopeles's.* I should not have mentioned

tion'd this, but that there are so many witnesses of it; and to show you what may be done, if they will have us proceed in this way of writing.

No, by no means, I know you will say, let us have no more of this stuff. I am very well pleased with the motion: and wish likewise they would not ground their replies upon hearsays, when they may believe their eyes. Let him not give any credit to him, who-

soever he be, that saith, *I dealt* ~~disingenuously~~ with Mr. Bridg in my quotations of him, but look into his Book, and make it apparent to me that I have wrested his words, and I will confess it, and make him the best amends I am able. It is as easie, I should think, for a Scholar to sit in his Study and read Books, as to gad up and down to hear and tell idle stories. But let not the Books he reads be cited impertinently, as the very Articles of the Church of

See pag.  
101. of  
his Book.

England

England are by him. An instance you have (and it is the first that comes to hand, but the rest are like it) p.87. For I never thought that the Fathers *looked for no more then transitory promises*. But that it was not by vertue of the Covenant made with *Moses*, that they looked for more, I did and do affirm. A great many of the Worthies mentioned, *Heb. 11.* lived before the Law was given, and the rest that followed them built their expectation on the same ground which they did. But we may well pass by such vain allegations out of the Articles, since the very Scriptures which he cites confute all that he saith. If *coming to Christ*, for instance, and *believing in him* be all one, which is apparent indeed from *John 7. 37, 38.* (cited by him, p.79.) then believing in Christ is more then *relying on him for pardon of sins*, for to *come to Christ*, is to become one of his Disciples, and to under-  
take



take to be of his Religion. This I have cleared sufficiently in the last Debate; and shown withal, that obedience to the Law of God is a condition of our Justification. No, saith this Gentleman, out of I know not what Author, p. 78. *It is not the condition of the Covenant so properly as of those persons that enter into Covenant.* Which is a monstrous absurd Answer to this Question: no better then to affirm and deny the same thing in the same breath. For if it be the same condition and qualification of those persons that enter into the Covenant, then it is the condition of their Justification, which they obtain by entering into Covenant with God so qualified. As for the words themselves, without relation to the Question, they are right enough, if they be understood not to deny our obedience to be a condition required in or by the Covenant, though it be

152 *An Appendix to the third Part*

be not so proper to say a Condition of the Covenant. For how comes our obedience to be a necessary condition or qualification of the persons entring into Covenant, but by the Covenant? That requires it, and doth not promise Justification without it; and therefore is a Condition in the Covenant of Grace.

But I have neither list nor leisure to trace his steps in these things; which I would wish him not to meddle withal, till he know where the very pinch of the Controversie lyes, & then we may end it one way or other in a few words.

Let him forbear also his odious insinuations, as that I think the *Papists good subjects*, p.67, suggest the N.C. lay'd aside the Lords Prayer, because of that Petition, *Forgive us our trespasses*, &c. p.39. and that they dislike the Common-prayer onely, or chiefly because taken out of the *Mals-book*. There are no such things  
said

said or intimated in my Book. And yet he himself dare not say that he knows no N.C. that refuse to joyn in it solely or chiefly on that account, but that he knows *scarce one intelligent N.C.* Very likely. He may know, notwithstanding, multitudes of silly ones; and here and there one whom he takes to be *intelligent*. But this is nothing to what this *intelligent* Non-conformist suggests concerning the Meetings of Dr. *Gunning*, and others in the late times, for Common-prayer; as if they were as much *Conventicles* as any now, p.68. Whereas they were according to the *Common-Law*, and not against it: unless he will maintain that *Ordinances* were Law, as much as *Acts* of Parliament. If that still lye at the bottom of their hearts, let them speak out. But who can believe that the *High Conformists* have not all, and alway been so constant and firm to the Government of King and Parliament, as  
they

they ought? Or is it likely that that Dr. Heylin was ill affected to Kingly Authority, or disrespectful to Superiours? So he would have you think, because of one passage in a Book of that Doctors (as you may see, p. 81, 82.) from whom he takes a measure of the rest. If he had known more, he would, I doubt not, have been so kind as to bestow it upon us: but this single speech was all he had in his Budget. If you please therefore, I will furnish him with some other as bold speeches (let him make what he can of them) concerning the actions of those times, as any in Dr. Heylin. Who should have expressed his minde in less offensive terms; having no meaning, I verily believe, to charge the King, who was then very young, with any guilt, but onely those greedy persons, who had possessed him with no better Principles. This is certain, that the best Preachers in those days, who

who spoke most against Non-  
 residence, took the boldness also  
 to tell the King openly in their  
 Sermons at Court, that un-  
 less he provided some remedy,  
 Cormorants would devour wholly  
 the livings appointed for the Mi-  
 nistry (o) the most part of which <sup>Mr. Gil-</sup>  
 were either robbed of the best part, <sup>pin: Ser-</sup>  
 or else clean taken away; by means <sup>mon,</sup>  
 of which, none had any heart to <sup>1552. p.</sup>  
 put their Children to School, any <sup>267, 268</sup>  
 further then to learn to write, to  
 make them Apprentices, or Law-  
 yers; the two wells of Learning,  
 Oxford and Cambridge were dry-  
 ed up, Students decayed, of which  
 scarce an hundred left of a thou-  
 sand; and if in seven years more  
 they should decay so fast, would  
 be almost none at all, but the De-  
 vil might make a triumph, whilst  
 there were none Learned to whom to  
 commit the Flock. In short, his  
 Majesty was told, that if his Grace  
 (as they spoke in those days) did  
 not speedily resist those ravening  
 Wolves,

Wolves, there was entring into England more blind ignorance, Superstition and Infidelity, then ever was under the Romish Bishop, and his Realm would become more barbarous then *Scythia*. Which lest *God Almighty*, said the Preacher, lay to your Graces charge, for suffering the Sword given you to rust in the sheath, bestir your self now in your Heavenly Fathers business. There was as plain Language used in Queen Elizabeth's days, in the Book called the *Ladened Ass*, said to be delivered to her at *Greenwich* (p), where Mr. *Gilpins* Sermon was preached. It makes express mention of that which Dr. *Heylin* touches upon, how the mighty Hunters had caught one of the most ancient and stateliest Bishopricks in the Land; *Durham*, I mean, which they had quite strangled, saith the Book (q), *dismembered and dissolved*. In later times Dr. *Sanderson* hath spoken the same

p July  
27. 1581.

q See p.  
34.

same sence, who was a man un-  
 exceptionable, both for loyalty &  
 regard to his Superiours. He not  
 only acknowledges, that the bu-  
 siness of the Reformation under  
 King *Edward* the sixth was carri-  
 ed on with a mixture of private  
 ends, and other such humane  
 frailties and affections as are in-  
 cident usually unto the inter-  
 prising of great affairs; but com-  
 plains of such Sacriledges then  
 acted, and that under the name of  
 Reformation (though he hopes  
 without his knowledge, at most  
 through the malicious suggesti-  
 ons and cunning insinuations of  
 some about him) as have cast  
 very foul blemishes upon our ve-  
 ry Religion, especially in the eyes  
 of our Adversaries, who are apt  
 to impute the faults of the per-  
 sons to their Profession. All  
 which notwithstanding, and a  
 great deal more which he there  
 (2) makes bold to say, was not a  
 casting dirt upon the Reforma-  
 M tion

Episco-  
 pacy not  
 prejudici-  
 al to Ro-  
 gal power  
 p. 81, 85,  
 92, 93.

tion, or upon the King, or upon any persons in Authority; but an honest confession, that they who had the managery of affairs in their respective times, were made of the same clay with other men, subject to infirmities and passions, and to bebyassed with partial affections, &c. *so that we have far greater cause to bless God, that in their then Reformation, in very many things, they did not a great deal worse, then to blame them that in some few things they did not a little better then they have done.* If this offend the Apologist, he may read the same complaints in Mr. Calovius, and in other of the Reformers, which I shall direct him unto, if he be not acquainted with them already, and do desire it. At present I shall trouble my self no further about it: this being sufficient to show the wickedness of that suspicion which he saith some may from hence entertain concerning these Conformists; *that if the King and*



Parliament should put forth their  
 hand now and touch all they have,  
 they would (unless fear restrain'd  
 them) curse them to their faces, p.  
 81. This was one of the charitable  
 thoughts of *Philagathus* also:  
 whom this man imitates in other  
 surmises, as if he was led by the  
 same evil spirit, which suggested  
 such groundless imaginations to  
 him. He will not say, I am an  
*Hawaw*; but it may be suspected,  
 he tells you, that there is some-  
 thing of the *Amalakites* ambition  
 in me; and that I am moved to  
 write, because there is some *Mor-*  
*decas* in the gate or the Parish that  
 will not bow to me, p. 92. They will  
 you see be the *Mordecai's*, the  
 elect people of God, and we must  
 be, at least indued with the qua-  
 lities of the people devoted to  
 destruction. And I remember  
 indeed, in the late times, that they  
 compared the *Episcopal Clergy* to  
 a *flamen and his Sons*, and told us *Beast*  
 in these words, (s) *We will keep a* wounded  
 M 2 day P. 4.

day of thanksgiving, in remembrance of deliverance from the *Bishops*, as the *Jews* did after *Haman* and his *Sons* were hanged: which will be a greater blessing then the deliverance from the *Gun-powder Treason*. But if I, from my pan, was now upon the Ladder ready to be turned off, and was to make a plain and full confession of my faults, as I hoped for Mercy; I could not charge my self with the least private grudge to any man whatsoever: and should protest that I never had any desire that any man, either in the Parish where I live, or out of it, should stoop or bow to me; no, nor give me more respect then it pleased himself to afford me. This childish ambition (which he suspects) is the furthest from my heart of all other things. I understand it not; nor had it the least finger in my Book, which was writ only out of a desire of Unity, Peace, good Order, and increase of true Piety. I have read in a Sermon

of a great Divine of our own,  
 preached fifty years ago (t), *that* Dr. San-  
 it is to be considered whether it <sup>derfon's</sup>  
 be enough for one of that profes- <sup>first Ser-</sup>  
 sion, which he supposes me to be, <sup>mon ad</sup>  
 not to meddle with these things <sup>Clerum,</sup>  
 and whether he be not bound in <sup>p. 24. in</sup>  
 conscience, especially in case he <sup>fol.</sup>  
 live among a people distracted in  
 opinion, to declare himself ex-  
 pressly, either for them or against  
 them, &c. Others may resolve  
 in this case as they see cause: I  
 have satisfied my self that I have  
 done as became an honest man.  
 But I did not think to have said  
 so much about this matter, nor is  
 it to any great purpose I see to  
 labour to clear our selves of their  
 vile suspicions; say what we will,  
 many of them stop their ears, or  
 drown our words with their loud  
 cries against us. We must have  
 naughty intentions, and they must  
 be the very best of men: the most  
 loyally affected to his Sacred Ma-  
 jesty (who would have thought  
 M 3 it?)

it ?) more then the very Bishops themselves, as this Author would insinuate. For *they would not be offended* (as the Bishops you may think would) *if the Statute of King Edward the Sixth were revived, whereby all Citations in the Courts Spiritual should issue out in the Kings Name, and with his Seal. And it would not displease them to have a Vicar-General in SPIRITUALIBUS,* as he

A Calumny assures you, p. 33. But he must long ago give us leave to think (as that Bishop now named speaks, who cast upon the Bishops, in hath demonstrated that Process in the Bishops name, no way in the humble Sup-trench upon the Kings Authority (1), that their meaning herein for Toleration, is "rather to do the Bishops hurt 1609. p. "then the King service; and that 10, 17. "their affections (so far as by what Revived "is visible we are able to judge in the late "thereof) are much what alike the times, "same towards both. This you confused by Bishop may read in his Book concerning San- Episcopacy not being prejudicial derfon.

to *Regal power*, p.3,4. And what he saith of the one, I may say of the other motion, which is of the same strain; and then made to *Queen Elizabeth*, when *Martin Mar-prelates* Book came out; not to greaten her power, but to depress the Bishops. So the Book called the *Ladened Ass* tells us, that there were Suitors then to her, for a greater Authority (if they could have got it) then *Cromwels General Vicarship over the Bishops and Clergy* (a): and that the very same men, who contrived this, were the favourers of the *Admonition, the frame of Discipline, the Mar-all-Libels*, and other new Monsters which then were yearly bred and brought forth. And truly, there is some reason to think that such men as this would be no more displeased with a new *Martin Mar-prelate*, then with a new *Vicar-General*. For he is not ashamed to approve of such vile Books as *Ladenissim Antocata-*  
M 4 crisis,

*crisis*, to which he sends us for information concerning the greatest Enemies of our Church and Religion, those who bring in new and strange Doctrines, *i. e.* plain Popery, p. 80. A Book writ by that haughty and violent spirit, which so often calls the excellent Bishop (y), mentioned by this Apologist in the entrance of his Work, by the scornful name of Dr. *Bramble* (z): and which puts Bishop *Andrews* and Bishop *Hall* among that Faction (as he speaks) whose *avowed Popery* was manifest from their Books. And therefore the Author of it justly defended that Censure which was given of him and his Book long ago, by a Reverend person now alive, who saith, *the man had seen some Visions in Trophonius's Den, Raptures, and Embryo's of his own adled brain; and out he came to vent them, like Esops Ass, jutting in Purple. He was high set in pursuit of fame; and scorning to*  
cope

y Bishop  
*Brambal*

z Re-  
view  
of fair  
warnings  
in the ve-  
ry Fron-  
tispiece  
of the  
Book.

cope with a PIGMEE, he challenges  
no less men then my Lords Grace  
of Canterbury, and all the Learned  
Divines of England; and much  
grieved he was, that my Lord him-  
self would not vouchsafe him the  
honour to confute him: as if a Sky-  
towering Eagle, or Gyre Falcon,  
should have stoopt to a Kite or Car-  
rion (a).

a Dr.  
Creigh.  
ton's Let-  
ter to Mr.  
R. Wat-  
son. 1650

But perhaps the Apologist ne-  
ver seriously considered that  
Book; as I am sure he hath not  
duly noted & weighed mine: For  
if he had, he would have repeated  
my words more sincerely, and  
not mis-represented them so often  
as he hath done; at least, not have  
put me in the number of those  
that are Enemies of our Church,  
dissent from its Articles, and bring  
in new and strange Doctrines. So  
he would have it thought; else  
why doth he oppose my words  
and the eleventh Article of our  
Religion the one against the o-  
ther?

XVII.

ther? p.85. |The comfort of it is, there is no clashing at all between them, but onely in his own brains, which understand not, it seems, that good Works may be necessary to our justification, and yet no cause of it. But thus he deals with me in other things: what I said of *Lawn-sleeves*, and the Black Cap and White (*first part*, p.81) he translates to *Surplices*, and makes an idle discourse about them, p.47. He makes you believe I said that *afternoon-Sermons* were wholly superfluous, p.61, when I onely told you that they might be used or not, as they should be found to be to Edification. The same perverse representation he makes of what I said about experiences, p.70. Preaching of Obedience, p.77. Doing good out of fear of threatnings, p.84. Pious discourses also, p.96. which were not by me disgraced, but their rash censures condemned. If I did not begin to be tyred with following



following him in his rambles, I could present you with a great many more Monsters of his own making; just like that which a Cheat promised to show his credulous spectators (they are the words of one whom he and I have often mentioned) an Horse whose Head stood in the place of his Tail; and when all came to all, he himself had tyed the Horse to the Manger the wrong way. Besides, barely to show these misrepresentations, would be a very dull business, and indanger the tiring you quite; and to make them appear ridiculous, would much offend his seriousness. For which reason, I shall let these (and a great many other things in his Book) alone, till he give me a further occasion.

But I intreat him, as he loves himself, to hold his hand till he hath learnt a little more Logick, and knows better how to draw consequences. At least, let him  
forbear

forbear to draw any out of my  
 Books, till he hath diligently  
 weighed every word, and the oc-  
 casion of it. For his manner is to  
 make very silly ones, and then  
 confute them, as you may read  
 in his Preface, and p. 107, 108. Mr.  
*Hughes, Mr. Vicars did thus and*  
*thus heretofore, therefore the N.C.*  
*are all thus and thus now. Is*  
*this, saith he, good Logick, and*  
*solid reasoning?* I say no; it is  
 childish and ridiculous: but it is  
 his own, not mine; who produced  
 such mens sayings to other pur-  
 poses. And I perceive it is his  
 manner to draw Universals from  
 Particulars. For presently after,  
 asking *Whether the N. C. shortly*  
*look to shut Heaven, and turn the*  
*waters into blood?* He tells you  
 Mr. Parker of N. England (whose  
 words I cited) saith no: and so  
 all the N. C. must be concluded  
 to be of his minde. In like man-  
 ner *the Church of Scotland*, he  
 tells you, *had as few Heresies, as*  
any

any other, p. 139. Therefore;  
 What? Then the N. C. were  
 not the cause of the strange and  
 new Doctrines, Opinions, Pha-  
 natical words and Phrases in  
 Preaching and Writing. For this  
 is part of his Answer to the  
 Question, *Whether they be so or*  
*no.* In time they may improve  
 this way of arguing very much,  
 as some did in the late times,  
 when they told us (b) *the Ro-* <sup>b Re-</sup>  
*mans and Athenians, whilst they* <sup>formed</sup>  
*were Free-states, bred ten to one* <sup>Presby-</sup>  
*more virtuous and illustrious* <sup>tery,</sup>  
*men, than other Governments, or* <sup>1645. p.</sup>  
*even they themselves at other* <sup>19.</sup>  
*times.* You know the Conse-  
 quence. And you may know  
 also what horrid Doctrines were  
 broached in *Scotland*, more than  
 any where else, destructive to  
 all Government: and that all the  
 Sectaries in *England* were the  
 spawn of those who stood dis-  
 affected to our Church; nay,  
 that *Hacket* himself and his mad  
 Com-

Companions (though disclaimed by them when they saw their end) sprung out of their Society, frequented their Sermons, and were their Associates, before they entred into those Frantick courses, as I can prove from good Authority. As also, that they are justly compared to the *Pharisees*, though that Sect were great sticklers for Ceremonies, and their Traditions: as they for their own Inventions. But for the present, let him read Dr. *Sanders*'s Sermon lately printed. And not trouble us with his Arguments for less Uniformity then there is among us, upon this ground, that we have not a present Uniformity in all things: which is a thing that is not to be here expected. Yet this pitiful reasoning he repeats again and again: like to that of Dr. *Bushy*'s reading Logick sometimes to his Scholars, to prepare them for the University: therefore, the

the N. C. may read a whole Circle of Philosophy, to keep Youths from going to the University, and to make the Education there unnecessary, p. 123. For there lyes the point : and he needed not have referred us to what some able men told him about the Oath, and the words of it at Oxford. For it is in print among the University-Statutes ( c ) : at the end <sup>c Statuta</sup> of which Book there is an ex-<sup>selecta</sup>plication of the Oath which is <sup>Anno</sup>taken to observe the Statutes. <sup>1661.</sup> Tit. 9. And this in the first place it <sup>Sec. 6.</sup> admonishes us of, *That the genuine sense of the words of the Statute, are to be taken from the minde and intention, not of him that swears, but of him that gives the Oath* ( d ). <sup>d Ib. p.</sup> Now it will be found, I take it, <sup>163.</sup> that they who give that Oath, intend not to prohibit the setting up of another University, where-into take Degrees ( which is not in the power of him that swears )  
but

but the keeping Schools for University-Learning, with intention to perfect Scholars there, and on purpose to keep them from the Universities.

XVIII. But I forget my self, and instead of writing a large Letter, shall make a great Book, if I proceed any further to detect all his weak Reasonings and slight Answers. Nor is it to much purpose; for I doubt they will not be the better by it. I have been often rounded in the ears with the words of *Artemorius* to the Author of *Argenis* (e) (applyed by a Reverend person to the like case) *Spare your pains, good Sir, they know they are wrong as well as you can tell them: but all the earth shall not make them confess an error, or amend it.* But suppose it be otherwise, as I hope it is with some, and heartily wish it may be with all; yet my labor may be spared, if all that pretend

*e Parce labori: non ignorant se errare,* &c. cited by Dr. Creighton in his Letter before mentioned.

to be wise and honest, would but  
 be humble (and truly he that is not  
 so, is neither of those) and make  
 that their business which certainly  
 is their duty. They are the words  
 of Bishop *Saunderson* (f), who thus <sup>f Preface  
to Clavi  
Trabales  
1661. p.</sup>  
 proceeds: "That is to say, if  
 "they would study *quietness*  
 "more and Parties less; bear a  
 "just reverence to *Antiquity*,  
 "and to their *bettors*; allow an  
 "favourable a construction to  
 "things established, as they are  
 "capable of; suspect their own  
 "judgements wherein it differeth  
 "from the *publick*; submit to  
 "reason, and yeild when they are  
 "convinced; obey cheerfully  
 "where they may, and where  
 "they dare not, suffer without  
 "noise, a little *saying* and *writing*  
 "would serve the turn. But when  
 "men are once grown to this, to  
 "make it their glory to *head* or  
 "*bold up* a Party; to study ways  
 "how to *evade*, when they are  
 "called to obey; to resolve to  
 N "erre,

" erre, because they *have erred*,  
 " and to *hold their conclusions*  
 " despite of all Premises; to pre-  
 " fer their private *opinions* be-  
 " fore wiser mens *judgements*,  
 " and their *reputation* with the  
 " Vulgar before *obedience* to Su-  
 " perious: In a word, to suffer  
 " themselves to be swayed with  
 " *Passions, Parties, or Interests*; all  
 " the writing and saying in the  
 " World, as to such men (until it  
 " shall please God to put their  
 " *hearts* into another *Frame*) is to  
 " no more purpose, then if a man  
 " should go about to fill a Sieve  
 " with water, or to wash a Black-  
 "amore white. And so fare you  
 " well.

Jan. 13. 1669.

*A*





## A Postscript.

I Had no sooner run over this Apologetical Catechism, and made a few Reflections on it, but I received a *Case of Conscience* from you, wherein I am also concern'd. A very weighty one it is, and as weightily and solidly resolved, if the *Casnist* may be his own Judge: who seems to have no low opinion of his own performance, but rather thinks we may chance to be beholden to him for a new invention. Here, saith he, p. 6. is that very *MEAN* indeed, for which I know, which is wanting. A great Discovery! And for ought I know, may any body reply, that which is *not wanting*, but is the very dangerous *Extream* into which the people are as apt to run, as he is to follow those with whom I have already had to deal. It would be no great matter indeed if he imitated them onely in their phrase, and not in their weak reasonings and frivolous observations; but he is too forward to that also: and is a notable instance of

N 2

the

Letter to  
Mr. Ma-  
shews,  
p. 69.

the truth of my Lord Bacon's observation, that there is little *dry light* (a) in the world, but it is all *moist*, being infused and steeped in affections, blood and humours. The Reason of men is made to stoop to their interest, and they judge according to the current of their inclinations and desires.

I.

¶ Pag. 128,  
129. edit. 1

I had some hopes that sober men would have consented to that which I said in the *Continuation* (b) of our *Debate*, and judged it very unbecoming such frail undertakings as ours, to go about to unfold the secrets of high Providence, and assigne the causes and reasons of those particular calamities which befall their neighbours. Nay, common prudence I thought would have taught any considering man to forbear the making such observations, as may be employed to any purpose, even against those that make them: insomuch that they who have served themselves by such arguments, when it comes to their own turn to suffer, can by no means endure to hear of them. And yet, behold, a grave *Casnist* come forth, who not onely spells, but thinks he can read the meaning of Divine Providence toward the late Lord Chancellor of England, who is not suffered now to live in it. He hath pickt it out of his own Letter left at his

his departure out of the Realm, in which he acknowledges that *his Credit had been very little since that Session of Parliament which was at Oxford*. What of all that? Why, he was the Contriver of that *Act*, says the interpreter of Providence, which banished Others from their houses; after which his Authority dwindled so much, that at last he was forced to leave his own house. As much as to say, if you will have the sense of this Privie Counsellor of Heaven in plain words, *God punishes him now for all that he did against them*. No, perhaps you will say, *against God*: for so the words run in his Prayer for him which immediately follows, *Do not thou, O God, for all he hath done against thee, &c.* But I suppose you understand the meaning of their words, and their opinion of themselves better, then not to know that what is done *against them*, is, as they construe it, done *against God*: and so whatever Calamity befalls any man after he hath opposed them, it is the hand of God avenging the quarrel of his people. Thus Mr. Bailly, I remember, in that Book which I have oft had occasion to mention, talks of *strange punishments* which God from heaven *visibly inflicted* (c) upon Mr. Corbet, the Author of a *Review*, Book called *Lyfimaebus Nicanor*, and Mr. *chap. 1.*

Maxwel who wrote another called *Ma-  
char's burden* : both against them, their  
Discipline and proceedings. And what  
were those *visible Judgements* ? Nothing  
but this; the Former, as I learn from the  
*Second Fair Warning*, was murdered by the  
Irish; and the Later ( being Archbishop of  
Down ) was stript stark naked, and left  
desperately wounded, but by Gods mercy  
recovered, and afterwards died a natural  
death. Had the like befallen any couple of  
his Brethren, (as that learned Writer adds)  
*he would have been forward to write with  
their blood some red letters in the Calendar,  
and made them pass currantly for two Mar-  
tyrs of the Discipline.* But these things be-  
falling two persons who exposed their evil  
principles and practices to the view of the  
world, they were *black marks* of Gods dis-  
pleasure, brands of infamy wherewith they  
were stigmatized from heaven for writing  
against his chosen. So we must believe, if  
we did not know very well, that *the hand  
of heaven* ( to use his words once more ) is  
*not guided by the mouth, nor Gods judgments  
discerned alway by the eye of the Disciplin-  
arian Brethren* : who we have little reason  
to think are well seen in the Myteries of  
Providence, when we finde them stone-  
blinde in the most common and ordinary  
mat-

matters. For who is there that sees not, how by this wretched way of discourting the worst Cause may be justified, and the best that is may be condemned? If all things that fall out one after the other, must be thought to have the same connexion, which the effect hath with the cause; *Porphy* will prove it self the true *Christianity*, unless you can show that you have the sole privilege to expound Gods Providence, and that no-body else may intermeddle in it. The *Tenth Argument* of *Bellarmino* (d) *d* Tom. 2. for *Image-Worship* is drawn meerly from l. de Reliquiis & Imag. cap. 12. the unfortunate ends and ill successes of the *Jannaschi*, (those that set themselves against *Images*) and the felicity of those who defended them. First of all, in the time of *Leo Isaurus*, after the *Images* of the *Saints* were burnt in *Constantinople*, there ensued a *Pestilence* in which died three hundred thousand people. The same *Emperour* and his Successors lost *Italy*, and could never recover it. In the times also of *Constantinus Copronymus*, another enemy of *Images*, entire *Cities* were overthrowed by *Earthquakes*; a grievous *Pestilence* raged, so that there was scarce room to bury the dead. And that there might be no doubt, saith the *Cardinal*, for what cause these things happened, there were at the

same time little *Cresses* to be seen on the garments of men, and the Priests vestments, as if they had been drawn with oyl. There was such an horrible *Cold* also, that the *Pontick Sea* was frozen for an hundred miles together, and the *Ice* was thirty Cubits thick; upon which a *Snow* fell twenty Cubits in depth: and when a *Thaw* came, great pieces of this *Ice* like Mountains or Islands swam up and down with great violence; and some dashing against the walls of *Constantinople*, broke down a part of them, and overturn'd the adjoyning houses. And yet the calamities were not completed, but a great *Drought* followed all this, so that Fountains, Wells and Riven were dryed up. Whereby all might understand, saith this Roman Diviner, that God was angry at their impiety against him and against his *Saints*. For lastly *Constantine* himself, that obstinate Emperour, died wretchedly; when on the contrary, they that with the *Pope of Rome* stood up for *Images* and defended them, were promoted to Kingdom and Empire, lived prosperously and reigned happily. What an heap of Observations are here to countenance that which you so much abhor? Who can chuse but take notice how God declared himself from heaven by all these

Pro-

Prodigies to be an enemy of those who were enemies of *Images*? When do you read of so many and so great misfortunes and dreadful Calamities in any age, as these upon the haters of *Images*; which point, as it were with the finger, to you that they ought to be worshipped? If you like not this kinde of arguing, I pray let it alone your selves. Let us not hear any more of the sad things which befall any particular men, as if they were upon the score of opposing or punishing Nonconformists. Nor tell us of any more Prodigies and Signes of Gods displeasure against the Realm, which have appeared since you were pulled down, like to those *Images*; much less expound those terrible Judgements which have justly befallen us (though not equal to those now mentioned) to be punishments for any thing done against you, and arguments that you are approved by heaven, and we rejected. After this manner the very Heathens defended their *Idols*, as the Papists do their *Images*. All things went ill with those who despised them; *Augustus, Vespasian, Titus* had prosperous Successes & fortunate Reigns; but the poor Christians, the great enemies of their Gods, were dragged continually by the Hang-man to be butchered, suffered the most exquisite torments, and  
for

for three hundred years together were most miserably haras'd, and barbarously used. And thus *Parsons* I remember disputes against all the *Protestants* from the unhappy success of those Princes which have in any sort oppos'd themselves to the *See of Rome*, as you may read at large in his *Apologetical Epistle* (c); none of which I shall now stand to transcribe.

e An. 1601  
sect. 7.

II. This is sufficient to shew what may be expected from this New Undertaker: who will appear, I doubt not, as lame in his other reasonings as he doth in this; and prove as unfit to determine *Cases of Conscience*, as to make *Observations* upon Providence. For first, he doth not fairly and candidly represent that which I said, but accuses me of such Resolutions in matters of Conscience, as never came into my thoughts. I am beholden to him, I confess, for some good words, and for his favourable opinion of me; but I could have been well content to have wanted them, on condition he would not have said, that I am so unkind, and so unconscionably intender, as to account that no man who transgresses an Act of Parliament can be a good Christian (c); nor askt, Whether indeed I think that every transgression of a Realm is no less then a deadly

f In the latter end of the first page.

ly



By fin? There was no occasion for this  
 Question, or for that Censure: unless he  
 be of the opinion that all sins are equal, so  
 that what a man saith concerning the *open*  
*breach* and *contempt* of *one* Law, is to be ap-  
 plied to all transgressions whatsoever of *any*  
 Law. I never said that no man can be a  
 good Christian that transgresses an Act of  
 Parliament, nor that *every* transgression of  
 a Statute is a *deadly sin*. These are inven-  
 tions of his own, upon occasion onely of a  
 single instance which I gave of *Defiance* to  
 a Law wherein some men *live* (mark my  
 words (g). From whence he draws an u-  
 niversal proposition, that he might the bet-  
 ter conclude me to be a man of no great  
 depth (h), that looks not to the bottom of  
 a business which lies before him. That  
 may very well be true; for it is no easie  
 matter: But I will try a little how far I  
 can see into this *Case* concerning the trans-  
 gression of humane Laws: which, as I  
 take it, depends upon this single point,  
*Whether humane Laws binde the Conscience?*  
 that is, whether we sin, if we be not obe-  
 dient to them? In the resolving of which  
 he that findes no difficulty, may well sus-  
 pect that he doth not fully understand it.  
 For if, on the one side, we say that Consci-  
 ence is not concerned; I beseech you what  
 is?

Friendly  
 Debate, p.  
 Edit. 1.  
 b P. 3. of  
 his Case.

is ? Nothing but our common discretion to keep our selves out of the reach of the Princes Sword ; whose anger and power we may dread , but whose commands we need not care a straw for. And if on the other side , we say that Conscience is concerned and obliged by their Laws , then there may follow great perplexities , when any thing is commanded that proves a common and an intolerable grievance. More difficulties I need not mention of this nature ; there being no dispute about commands to do sinful things : but immediately apply my discourse to the Question. And for all that which was last said , since there is no greater mischief then disobedience to Laws, and nothing can so certainly secure obedience, as a sense of duty ; we must determine that a man is bound to make a conscience of observing the Laws of his Governours, which are not contrary to the Laws of God. So the holy Scripture it self teaches us to speak, when it requires us , and makes it necessary, *to be subject for conscience sake, and not onely for wrath*, Rom. 13. 5. that is, out of a sense that we cannot be innocent , and preserve a good conscience before God, unless we be observant of their Laws, where we are not pre-engaged by a higher Authority then theirs,  
The

The very same is included in those words, which require our submission to every ordinance of man for the Lords sake, 1 Pet. 2.13. which if we do not yield, it is manifest, the disobedience is a violation of a General precept of God exacting our obedience to them. Inſomuch that to ſet a mans ſelf in oppoſition to their Laws, is by interpretation to oppoſe the Almighty : according to that of the Apoſtle, *Whoſoever reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God.*

Yes, ſaith this Caſuiſt ; but will you pronounce thus without any diſtinction ? Doth a man commit a deadly ſin every time that he tranſgreſſes an Act of Parliamēt ? I anſwer, That's without the limits of the Queſtion. We are not ſpeaking of the degrees of ſin, which are of more or leſs guilt according as the Law is of greater or leſſer concernment, and as a mans tranſgreſſion of it, is with modeſtie, or with a high hand : nor are we conſidering when, and in what caſes, a Law may ceaſe to oblige, and quite alters its nature : but whether while it doth oblige, and is in force, it lays a tye on the Conſcience or no, and whether all Laws do ſo or no. And to this we ſay, Yes ; [Laws while they are obligatory do binde the Conſcience] be-  
 cauſe

III.

cause the Scripture saith so : and we say so indefinitely, because that's the Scripture language also. But stay a little ; this Gentleman cannot believe that. The Scripture saith the Magistrate is *Gods minister to us for good*, Rom. 13. 4. Very true ; and the Apostle makes that an argument why we should be obedient to him , because it is much for our profit and benefit. But this *Casualist* turns the words quite another way, and makes them an outlet to disobedience : by taking that to include an *Exception* to the General precept of subjection, which is in truth Nothing but a *Reason* to inforce it. To countenance which interpretation , he tears a little patch out of Bishop Taylor's Rule of Conscience, and would draw him into confederacie with him : who accommodates indeed those words of the Apostle to the illustration of a particular case , but never intended any such use of them as this man makes ; as is apparent from the entire Body of his discourse, and shall be touched afterward. Now let us hear this mans *Exception*. If the Magistrate , saith he, command that which is for the peoples *Good and welfare*, they are bound in conscience to obey him : otherwise they are not bound in conscience, but for wrath sakes, that

that is, because they dare not do as they would and as they may. Very well: But who shall judge of that; I mean, whether a Law be for the Publike good, or no? His Answer is ready at his tongues end, (for he need not go deep for it) *The Magistrate must judge what is for the Publick good as to the MAKING of the Law: and we must judge as to our OBEDIENCE to it.* Then which it is hard to write any thing more inconsiderate or dangerous, and it declares to me, that he did not understand or minde the meaning of the words which he wrote. For what do we mean by a *Law*? Doth not the very form or essence of it (as the Casuists speak) consist in the Precept or the Command of the Law-giver? If so; then that which we call a *Law* is not meerly the *signification* of his *minde* and *judgement*, that he thinks such a thing to be good or bad for us: but a *declaration* of his *will* and *pleasure* that we should do that good or avoid that evil which he commands us to do or avoid: And, God having given him this authority to command us, this *declaration* carries with it an obligatory vertue to bind us to the execution of his will, under the pain of sin. Nor is it of any moment, as to the obligation, whether there be a punishment threatned or not by him to the disobed-

disobedient. For the punishment is necessary onely by consequence, and upon supposition that the people may be negligent and refractory to the will of the Lawgiver, unless they be moved to comply with that which he thinks necessary to be observed, by fear of punishment. To *make a Law* then is to declare to us his will to lay such an obligation upon us. When this is done, we are no longer free whether we will do accordingly or no. If we be, the very nature of a Law is taken away, and every man is left to his own will. That which we call a *Law*, is but onely the *Princes opinion* concerning that which he judges to be for the Publike good; and so he is turned into a private person, and made like one of his subjects; for they obey not his judgement and pleasure, but their own. And if he punish them for disobeying *his*, that is onely a signe that he is stronger then they, who suffer unjustly for doing well, not for doing ill.

- IV. But let us hear his *reason* for this wonderful decision; which he hath as ready as he had his *Answer*. *Because*, saith he, *God hath made every man judge of his own actions*. What then? That you must seek by looking back, if perchance you may finde  
some

some Consequent of which this is the cause. The Question, you remember, was, Who shall judge what Laws are for the Peoples Weal, *i. e.* the Common Good of them all? Why, the Magistrate may judge thus far, as to make Laws; but the People themselves must judge, as to their obedience, *i. e.* they are not bound to do any thing he bids them, unless they think it is for their welfare. Why so? *Because*, saith he, *every man is made by God the Judge of his own Actions.* I cannot for my life see how that follows from this, though I have put his reasoning into the plainest form that ever I could. Which is this: God hath made every man judge of his own Actions, therefore he hath made him judge what Laws are for the Peoples Weal, before he obey them. If he can shew me the necessary connexion of these two, and that the former infers the latter, I shall acknowledge that he is a deep man, and much beyond my reach. But they seem to me so widely distant, that one can never pass from the one to the other by the longest train of Consequences. That you may think indeed is the fault of the shortness of my Discourse, which will not bring me within view of this Truth: For he reckons me to be such a pitiful Gamester, that I am not reflective (as he speaks) upon *i Pag. 3.*  
 O more

more removes than one of those many I ought to see. It may be so, and I am not unsensible of my own weakness; yet I have done my endeavour to comprehend him, and to fathom the bottom of his deep Discourse, which seems to me shorter and more imperfect than he thinks mine. For he doth not reflect on that which is just next to what he hath said and lies close to it; whilst he rambles to that which lies so far off that no *reminders* will bring him to it. Let him try, if he please: And begin with this Principle, *God hath made every man judge of his own Actions*: which may be put into these more intelligible words, *God hath made every man to determine whether that which he doth be conformable to his Rule, which is the Law or Will of his Creator*. Now what is next to this? *Therefore*, according to this Casuist, *He hath made every man to determine what Laws are for the Publick Good before he obey them*. Doth this follow the other? No such matter. The immediate Consequent of that Principle is this, therefore he hath made him to determine, whether that which Humane Laws enjoin be not cross to his Rule, the Law of God. Now whither will this carry us, or what lies next to it? This; I take it, That if what Humane Laws enjoin be not controlled by that higher Law, he is determined



mined by his very Rule of life to be obedient in that Point. Whether it be for the Publick Good or no that he should do it, is another thing, out of the compass of his Judgment; God having made another Judge of that, *viz.* his Prince, the Governour and Ruler of all. Who by the very *making a Law* determines what is for the Publick Good, and obliges us, as hath been said already, to comply with it by virtue of Gods Law which requires our subjection to him. This is implied in the very term of *making a Law*: And therefore it is not sense to say, He shall judge what is good as to the making a Law, and we as to obedience; for he doth not only *judge*, but *enjoy* when he makes a Law. Which leaves us no liberty but that which he cannot take away (because given us by him, that gave him his Authority) to judge whether his Will and Gods do not clash together. When this is known and determined, we have no more to do, unless we will place our selves in the Throne, and become Sovereigns, by determining otherwise concerning the Publick Welfare than the Proper Judge of it doth. Which in this Nation would be the more insolent and unsufferable, Because there is nothing determined here to be for the Peoples good, and passes into a Law for them, but by the advice,

desire, and consent of those whom the People themselves chuse to represent them, and to consider and judge what is most conducing to their Welfare. This is plain reason; and whatsoever inconveniences may ensue from hence, they shall be considered afterward: And should there be no way found to avoid them, they will appear not to be so great, as to resolve in general terms, as this man doth, that they who are to obey, and to follow Publick Orders and Decrees, are to judge themselves what is for the Publick Good. Mark I pray you, whither these *Casuiſts* drive. Other *Non-conformiſts* have absolved the People from all Laws about Church matters: And here now is one started up to teach them how to free themselves, if they please, from all Civil Laws and Statutes of the Realm. None shall bind but such as they think good: That is, every man is made a *King* and Governour himself. The danger of which determination I shall a little lay before you.

- V. First, it is certainly no easie thing to judge what is best for the Peoples good: But *Kings* themselves find it necessary to have their Council to deliberate and advise them to that which will promote it, which they declare to their People by their *Laws*. And  
if

if they did not, the Publick Welfare would be but little regarded, though we supposed every man better able to anderstand it than he is.

For ( *secondly* ) when men do know what is conducing to it, they will not presently do it, if their present private Interest incline them otherways. From which two grounds *Plato* I remember derives the necessity of *Laws*. There are few private persons that know what is most profitable for Common Life, and of those that know, fewer can or will do it, unless the will of a Superiour Power be signified to them and oblige them to it. It is not hard indeed to know what will please themselves, and may make for their own private utility: But what will make for the General Good, that is difficult for them to comprehend, and more difficult to bring them to do it, because they are not inclined to prefer the good of all before that of their own Private Persons. No, *Mortal*

*Nature* ( *k* ) hath a violent Propension to covet k Plato L. 9. de Legi- bus p. 375. 380. and draw all to its particular self; always in a brutish manner, that which is feels grievous, and pursuing that which is pleasant and delightful. For which reason Law is needful to bound, direct, and govern him, since of himself he will not mind the Publick Good. If indeed men were of such

1. *Noting*  
*superior,*  
*not to be*  
*disput.*

a nature, saith he, that they understood the Common Good, and had such a portion of Divinity in them, that they would alway follow it, they would stand in need of no *Law*: For that would be better than any Law or Order whatsoever. But since it is rare to find such men; we must make the World as good as we can, by making them subject to a better and more disinterested reason than their own, which is the Publick *Order and Law* (1). And whosoever he be that makes every man judge of what is for the *Peoples Weal*, that man takes away the principal Power of the Magistrate. For he supposes the *People able* to judge of that; and if they be, there is no need of any Law; and consequently of no Law-giver.

But thirdly, they are so far from being *able* to judge what is for the Publick good, that the wisest and best Princes with their Councils find it very difficult; and in many Cases are a long time considering about it before they come to a resolution. And that, though they have the help of those who have been long versed in affairs of this nature, and it is their business on which they attend; they have nothing else to mind unless they please, and information comes to them from all parts, which every private man cannot have; but as he hath something else to do,

so

so he can know but a few of those things which are to be considered in the case. Good and evil, gain and loss, advantage and disadvantage (as that excellent Bishop (m) I have so often cited may teach him) ought not to be weighed or esteemed from the consideration of one or two Circumstances or Emergents. "All Charges, Damages, and Reprises must first be cast up and deducted before one can give a right estimate of benefit or loss. If a Merchant reckon only the Price which his Commodity cost him beyond the Sea, without accounting Customs, Freight, and other Charges, he will impoverish himself, when he thinks he hath sold it to good profit. If the benefit also be only Temporal, and the loss Spiritual (which few think of) as to gain Gold and lose Faith, which is more precious than Gold that perisheth, it is no benefit, whatever a man imagines, but loss and damage. The *English Church* and the *English Kingdom* are one and the same Society of men, differing not Really, but Rationally one from another, in respect of some distinct Relations. And that which is truly good for the *Kingdom of England* cannot be ill for the *Church of England*; nor that which is truly good for the *English Church* be ill for the *English Kingdom*.

m Replie.  
to Bish. of  
Chalcedon.  
p. 235, 236

But yet, alas! how hard is it to comprehend what is good for both, and how few can attain it? When so *many men* are to be considered in *different relations*, and there are so *many things* and circumstances that must be considered to make them happy in both *these relations*; and when their good and happiness depend not upon what is done for them in one, but in both, nor in a respect to a few Circumstances, but to all: any of which if they be wanting, it is not good, but evil. I need not mention the Rule for this, which is commonly known: but ask now, what shall be done when there are so many things to be considered, which will cost so much time and pains to weigh, before we can know what will make for the Publick Good? Shall a Private man (whom we now suppose to have the liberty which this Casuist gives) judge without considering or attending to all those things which the Supreme Magistrate had a regard to in making his Law? This is very hard, that a Publick Decree, standing on such good grounds, should be thrown down by one that knows them not. And how ill will the Publick Good be provided for at this rate, by those that know little what belongs to it? Or shall we suppose every Private man to be of quicker dispatch than their Governours, able to run over

over all things that are to be considered with more speed than they can do? That's very unlikely, if you reflect upon all that hath been said; and that they have not those advantages of knowing neither what is to be considered, as Publick persons have. Or, in conclusion, must the Prince be content to wait till his Subjects have found means to know all that he doth, and till they have considered it, and till they be satisfied that his Law is for the Publick Good, before he expect any obedience from them? What then shall become of the Publick Good all that time which they take to think of the business? And who knows how long it will be before they are informed and have considered all things? And what if they be so scrupulous as never to be satisfied, because for any thing they know there is more to be considered than they have yet heard of? Besides; there are some Laws which require speed and Expedition in the execution: Must all these stand suspended, no body knows how long, till the Subjects be agreed they are for the Publick Good? Must the Equity, Fitness, and Profitableness be sifted by every man if he please; and after all, if he do not like it, may it be rejected? The Prince is in an ill case who hath such Subjects; and he is not in very good whose Divines begin but to  
instill

instill such Doctrine into them.

For ( fourthly ) grant the Subjects such power, and in a little time no Law shall be observed, unless it be by the duller sort of People: The subtil, the fine, and the Conceited will be under no Obligation. Such as the *Lacedaemonians*, who could not tell to twenty ( *n*, ) as we say, may prove much addicted to Laws ( as *Plato* tells us they were above all the *Gracians* ) but they who have more skill, and especially such as can tell how numerous their Party is, will easily absolve themselves, if it be against their private interest to obey them. For such is the passionate love men bear to their own private Concerns, that they will be very prone to conclude a thing to be a publick mischief, which is only a particular burden to their dear selves. Let the Parliament, for instance, grant his Majesty a Tax, and it will be poorly paid at this rate, and many times not without force: He must take it from his Subjects by violence, and be accounted an Oppressour, if they judge it not to be for the Common Good. And it will be very hard for those that love money not to be of that judgment. Their Covetousness will suggest to them, that he stands in no need of it, having a great Revenue; or that it is not for a good End; or that the Proportion is too great for those ends

n 2<sup>d</sup> 2-  
es<sup>tr</sup>.  
Sec. Plato  
in Hippia  
Majori.



ends that are pretended; and an hundred such like things too long to remember. Nay, what should hinder if he exact it of a poor people, as they may vote themselves, but that they take Arms also for the Publick Good, and the ease of the Subjects, as they did in *Richard* the Second's time? The Parliament at *Northampton* granted the King a great Subsidy of *Head-money*, at which some of the Rabble took great distaste, and said it was an Oppression, and tended to their utter undoing. Presently the rest prick'd up their ears at the new truth, and the glorious discovery which was made of the peoples right to preserve themselves. They were ashamed of their old ignorance, and resolved to prove good Scholars of those Masters who taught them not to suffer any thing to be done to the Peoples hurt. Their *Lords* and the *Lawyers* they learnt were Tyrants who must not be endured: And therefore to their Arms they betook themselves to root them out. And who could blame them, since they were *Judges of their own Actions*, and must determine what is for the Peoples Weal? Thus they did also in after times, when *Henry* the Seventh had an aid granted him by Parliament, in the beginning of his third year, toward the Relief of the Duke of *Brittain*, assaulted by the *French* King. And although the

Printed  
at Middle-  
burgh,  
1628.

the King did not enter into the War but by the advice of the Three Estates, who willingly contributed to it, yet the *Northern* men raised a Rebellion under colour of the money imposed, and murdered the Earl of *Northumberland*, whom the King had employed in that Collection: As you may find in our Historians, and in a *Dialogue* (o) between a Councellour of State and a Justice of Peace, said to be writ by Sir *Walter Raleigh*. In his thirteenth year also, as you may there find (p. 50.) a new Subsidy being granted, the *Cornish* men took Arms, as the *Northern* men of the *Bishoprick* had done before. And indeed, thus the Tumults in *Scotland* began: They must take care of the peoples good, whatsoever became of the Laws. And though the Law construe all Levying of War (as that *Dialogue* observes, p. 56) without the Kings Commission, and all Forces raised to be intended for the death and destruction of the King, not attending the sequel; and it is judged so upon reason (saith he) for every unlawful and ill action is supposed to be accompanied with an ill intent: Yet the Publick Security was pretended, and upon this score a new Government by *Tables* (as they called them) erected expressly against the Kings Commandment, a *Covenant* entred into, and a *seditionous Band* annexed

annexed to it, several *Troops* raised, and at last an *Army* formed, *for the peace and comfort of all the people* (p). By all which you see plainly that this Principle leads to downright Rebellion, if the Subjects think good to follow it; they being Judges as well of that which they are to do, as of that which they are not to do. But let us, if you please, content our selves with some lesser instances of its mischievous consequence. A Priest of the *Roman Church* thinks, notwithstanding the Laws which prohibit him, that it is for the Peoples Weal for him to come hither and draw the Kings Subjects to a dependence on the Pope. Doth he sin in this, or doth he not? If he do, then this Principle is naught: For he is Judge of his own Actions as well as you. Why should he not? Since *every man is made by God the Judge of them*. From whence he may conclude, with this *Casnist*, that he is not tied to obey any Law which he thinks is not for the Peoples good. The very same Pretense the People will have, should they molest or drive away those strangers that live among them, though the Law should not only permit, but invite them to transplant themselves hither, because they eat the bread out of the Natives mouths. And this was the very case in 9th year of *Hen. 8.* 15 17. when there was a great heart-burning against

p They were their own words

*Aliens*

*Aliens* in the City, especially among the *Artificers*, who were much grieved that so many *Strangers* were permitted to resort hither. And one *John Lincoln*, a Broker, busied himself so far in the matter ( which afterward brought him to the Gallows ) that about *Palm-Sunday* he came to Dr. *Standish*, who was to preach at the *Spittle* on *Monday* in *Easter Week*, and desired him he would declare the *great mischief* that was like to come to the Realm by the liberty which *Strangers* enjoyed: and he offered him a Bill to read, which he refused. But he prevailed with him that was to preach on the *Tuesday* to accept it, and publish it: The Contents of which was, the grief which many found by *Strangers who took away the living from Artificers*, &c. When he had read it, he began his Sermon with this Sentence, *The Heaven is the Lords, but the Earth he hath given to the Children of men*. From whence he shewed by as plain consequence as this in our *Casuist*, that this Land is given to *English men*, and therefore as *Birds* defend their *Nests*, so ought *Englishmen* to cherish and maintain themselves in their Land, and to grieve and hurt *Aliens*, for respect of their *Common-wealth*. I will not trouble you with the rest of the Story ( *q.* ) nor with the *Uses* or Application which the People made of this goodly

q Which  
you may  
find in the  
*Survey of*  
*London*, by  
*J. Stow*,  
p. 152, &c.

goodly Sermon: Only this you may know in general, that they bestirred themselves lustily for respect of their Common-wealth. That was the word then, as now it is in this Casuist, the *Peoples Weal*: of which he teaches them to take a tender care. And it will be no hard matter to improve their understanding of their own good, and their affection to it so far, as to make them digest this new truth: mentioned by his late Majesty in his Large Declaration (r;) That *what Subjects do of their own heads is much better than what they do in obedience to Authority; the one favouring of constraint, but the other being voluntary and chearful obedience.* Why not? Since at the same time they may be taught that *all power is originally in them, and came from them*: who intrusted particular persons with it. Which is the surest proof (they will easily believe) that it is to be employed for their good (for they would not have intrusted it with any body to other purposes) and consequently they must retain the power still to hinder those persons from doing otherwise; and in order to that must judge whether they do so or no. This indeed is for the People to command the Magistrate, not to obey him: But it is that Authority which they may fairly assume to themselves from this mans dangerous Maxime. For if People

are

r Pa. 407.  
out of the  
Protesta-  
tion. 22.  
Sept. 1638

are to submit in all things that are for their good, and no further; then they appeal back to themselves. And this appeal, they may well think, supposes power originally in themselves; some of which they have reserved, as supreme and above all Laws; and why they should not take all back when they judge it is not imployed for their good, who can tell? For they are to obey no Laws but those which are for their good, unless it be for *fear of wrath*; and when they combine together they need not fear that, but can make themselves dreadful, and give what Laws they please to their Governours.

- VI. No, saith this Casuist, *a man must not resist; that is express, and rather than resist he must suffer, p. 4.* But this is to steal a Goose, and stick a Feather. Why *must* he, when he is already perswaded that he need not unless he be forced? It is resolved just before, that if the Magistrate command any thing for the Peoples hurt, there lies *no Obligation upon Conscience* to be obedient, and they are made judges of what is for their hurt. If then he require them not to resist, and they find this is to their hurt, they are not bound *in Conscience* not to resist, but only *for wrath*. And that is not to be feared when the

the multitude is agreed not to suffer themselves to be injured. But *they must avoid contempt and scandal*. And so they will in their own opinion, even when they are contemptuous and scandalous. They are Judges of all their own actions for the publick good; and they may resolve that which we call contempt and scandal, to be for the *honour* of the Nation, for the making their Prince *glorious*, by rescuing him out of the hands of those evil Councillors, who procure Laws for their own private interest, and not the peoples good. In short, this Principle, if it be pursued, will prove the very same with that (in the perverse meaning of it) so much cryed up when all our mischiefs began, *The welfare of the people is the Supreme Law*: for the right understanding of which Maxime, I refer you to the *last Lecture* of Dr. *Sander-son*, about the Obligation of Conscience. Who hath uprightly determined elsewhere (*s*), that we ought to obey a Law, *Practically*, made by a just Authority, not onely when *9.N.9* it may be supposed to be made with an ill intention, but when it is *unprofitable for the Publick*, nay, something *noxious* and hurtful: provided the thing it commands may be done without sin. The Reason is, because every man ought to minde what

belongs to his part and duty, and not trouble himself about other mens; and our duty is to obey, not to command and ordain. Besides, I may add, though the Magistrate ought not to ordain any thing but what is for the peoples good, yet when he doth otherwise, it will be more for their good to obey him, then to refuse obedience. They ought still to look upon him as *Gods Minister for their good*, because they receive a great many benefits by Government and Order, be it what it will) though in that particular he do amiss; and so to submit to his command. For the mischief of not obeying, is greater then the hurt that is done the people by obedience. It is in effect to turn all things upside down; to reduce the King to the condition of a private man, by making every body a Judge of his Laws whether they shall be obeyed or no. The very truth is, such Casuists as these have quite unhinged the people from their dependance on their Governours, and subjection to them: And I may say of them, as the *secular Priests* did of the *Jesuits* in another matter (t): They have not only much impeached the due estimation, honour and reverent respect which the people carried toward their Superiours, but they have exceedingly impaired (by their tricks, shifts

t Dialogue  
between  
Secular  
Priests &  
Lay Gen-  
tlemen,  
1601. pag.  
67.

and



and evasions) the natural sincere condition of our people: which is there most decayed, where they have had conversation and dealing. Many of modest and temperate constitution, are become imperious, brazen-fac'd and furious: They that were lowly and humble, are become peremptory, rash in their judgements, and disdainful. The simple and sincere are grown cunning and double dealers, full of equivocation in their words, and dissembling in their behaviour.

Well; perhaps you will say we are all bad enough; but when the Doctor now named (Bishop Sanderson) determines that we should be obedient, though the thing required of us be *something* hurtful to the Publick, doth he not imply that, if it be extremely hurtful, we are not obliged? To this I will answer before I end; when I have first told you, that it doth not follow from what hath been said concerning an obligation upon Conscience to yeild obedience to Laws, that every transgression of a Law, is of so deep a dye as some is. He asks my opinion, you know, about this, in the beginning of his Case: And therefore I think good briefly to direct him to a better medium then any that he hath propounded to finde out the several degrees of

VII

fin against Humane Laws; and what Laws are of such moment, that a man cannot be accounted a good Christian, or a good Subject that *lives in defiance* of them. For this end, look back to what was said concerning the nature of a Law, which will lead you to a right understanding in this matter. It is a Declaration of the will of a Prince concerning those things which he judges needful to be done, or avoided by his Subjects. The more needful then he judges any thing to be done or avoided, for the Publick good and safety, &c. and the more it appears his will is set upon it; the more his Law is to be revered, and the greater the offence is, if it be broken, especially openly, and with an high hand. Now you may know this, partly by the *matter* *in self*, as all wise men have determined; if it be a matter of Justice, Charity, Piety, Religion or Peace. Partly, by the *manner and form* of commanding and forbidding; partly by the *greatness of the penalty* threatened in case of disobedience, and (lastly) very much by the *Preface* to his Law: in which, if he be pleased to expound the *Reasons* and the *necessity* of it, and they appear to be great and weighty, his *mind* and *will* is thereby, without all doubt declared, that a more then ordinary regard

he had to that Law of his. Apply now all this, if you please, to the Law which hath moved this dispute, and you will finde that I had reason to say what I did, and that they have no reason to equal the breach of other Laws (which they mention) with the breach of that. An Act of the seventeenth of our present Sovereign made at Oxford, required such persons as had not, and should not perform some things therein named, not to come within five Miles of any Corporation, &c. The breach of which Law I hold to be a grievous sin, and when a man *lives* in it, and *indefatigable* of it keeps Conventicles, I said his piety and honesty might justly be called in question. My Reason is, because it is plain to me by those indications now named, that the Law-giver judges it to be a matter of great consequence, and that he is much concerned it should be observed. For first the Preface to it is solemn, and lets us know that both Religion, and the Civil Peace and tranquillity depends upon it, and that they are removed from Corporations, because if they were there, they might take an opportunity the better to distill the Poysonous Principles of Schism and Rebellion into the hearts of his Majesties Subjects, to the great danger of the Church and Kingdom.

This is the reason and ground of the *Act*, which is as great as well can be; and therefore the penalty is great; *forty pound* for every offence: and (as I remember) imprisonment for six months, without Bail or Mainprize (if two Justices of Peace please) unless upon or before such commitment they shall swear and subscribe the *Oath* and *Declaration* mentioned in the *Act*. Compare now this with the other about *burying in Linnen*, and about *Waggons* which they make such a talk of, and you will finde neither the *Penalties* (*five pound* in one *Act*, and *forty shillings* in the other) nor the *Reasons* given in the *Prefaces* any thing near so considerable as those now mentioned. Which is a signe that the Law-giver doth not judge them of equal moment and necessity; and consequently that the transgression of these Laws is not so heinous, nor so much against his will, as the transgression of the other. The *Penalties* also for offences against these are ordered to be so employed, that they may do as much good to the Publick, as the offences do hurt, setting aside contempt of Authority, which I cannot excuse,

VIII. But may not a Law-giver, you will say,  
be

be mistaken in his judgement, as some think there was an error in that which was enacted about *Waggons*? And if he be, why should we observe such a Law? I Answer, I am not bound absolutely to be of the Law-giver's *opinion*, that all such things are for the Publick good which he decrees: I am onely to follow his *will*, and do what he enjoyns when I can without sin. And this I take my self bound to, even when I conceive it were better for the Publick, if it were otherwise ordained. What? will you say again, when there is an intolerable inconvenience, and a very grievous evil to the subjects by obeying? That's the thing I know you would be resolved in. And truly the Moral Divines and Lawyers say no. It is to be supposed, when that case happens, that it not being the intention of a Prince to make his Subjects miserable, he would not have made that Law, if he could have foreseen such a mischief. And therefore it ceases of it self to be a Law, and loses its Obligation. But then in the reducing this to practice, they tell you there are these *cautions* to be observed. First, Obedience is never to be denied, but when the Law is against the *Publick good*. If it be still consistent with the Publick interest, though it be to the damage of some

particular persons, they may not break the Law. Again, it must be practised then only when the Mischief to the Publick is not small, but so great, that in the judgement of the best and most prudent persons, it be a sufficient cause of disannulling a Law: and doth out-weigh the evil of material disobedience. And (thirdly) this mischief likewise must be certain and notorious, not only in our fancy. The security of which is, when it is declared so by the voice of all men (at least of all the wise and good) and not only by a party, whose particular interest is concerned to vote it to be unsupportable. And yet in case the truly wise and good on all sides think it so, they ought not (fourthly) to disobey the Law with the scandal and offence of other men. It must be done so modestly, humbly, and with fear, that the rest of Mankind be not taught hereby to slight all Laws upon little pretences, and trifling regards. And (lastly) to secure all, we must, if we have time and opportunity, ask leave of the Law-giver, whose leave is to be presumed in such cases, only in time of a sudden danger. And having done thus; if we should be mistaken, and judge that a publick mischief which is not, yet the guilt of our disobedience will not be deadly, but  
such

such as will easily finde pardon both with God and man. To this purpose you may read more in that Doctor (Bishop Taylor) out of whom this Casuist quotes a line or two, relating to this matter onely, separated from all the rest of his discourse. Which gives me occasion to note his disingenuity; for besides all the Cautions which the Bishop (r) there gives, I observe (since I write all this) that he expressly determines point-blank against this mans decision of his Case. For this is his Maxime, Rule 7. *That a Law should oblige the Conscience, does not depend upon the acceptation of the Law by the people.* Which, supposing that which hath been already said, is a certain Rule he tells you, and there is no doubt in it.

Rule of  
Conscience, Book  
3. R. 3.  
N. 16. *See*

Of this minde were the first Christians (as I shall not now stand to show you) and our first Reformers of Christianity in this Kingdom. Who, I must let you know, used no such distinctions, as these men do now; but said exprelly the same that I do. *That we must submit to all manner of Ordinances of men for the Lords sake, so long as they ordeyne nothing contrary to the expresse Word of God. And he that resysteth shall receive to hymself dampnation; for as moche as he*

IX.

an Obedi-  
ence of a  
Christian  
man, fol.  
26

printed  
by John  
Day with  
priviledge  
1547. chap.  
26.

be resysteth the Ordinance of God. They are the words of a Book called, the Destruction of *Small Vices*, written in *Edward the Sixth's* days, as far as I can guess. Tyndal also taught the people thus (x): Whosoever keeps the Law of the Prince, whether it be for fear or vain-glory, or profit, though no man reward him, God will bleſs him abundantly, and send him worldly prosperi- ty; as thou readest, *Deut. 28.* what good blessings accompanied the keeping of the Law, and as we see the *Turks* far exceed in Christian men in worldly prosperity, for their just keeping of their temporal Laws. And in another nameless Book, called the sum of the Holy Scripture (y), I find this Decla- ration, That the very Christen yeldeth hym- self willingly under the Governauce of the Sward, and Temporal Justice; he payeth taitles; he honoureth the Puissance, and worldly highness; he serveth, he bealpeth; he doth all that ever he may do, to thintent that the same Puissance may prosper, and be kepte in honour and feared: albeit, that the same Puissance to him is neither need- ful nor profitable. And if he should not do so, he were no Christen, but should sin against the Rule of Charity. For he should give evil ensample to other, that they should not honour the Temporal Puissance, but despise



despise it. And this despising of the Temporal Puissance, bringeth dissention, and (mark this) maketh sensual persons profitable unto nothing.

It would be too tedious to add the words of other good men, and therefore I shall only desire you to ponder the counsel and direction of the famous *Amyraldus*, late Professor at *Saumur*. For you are much concerned in it, being given with a particular respect to our affairs, in an address to our present Sovereign (x). "There are three things, saith he, by which the course of our life is governed, and, as we may say, steered in this Sea of worldly affairs. By the Law of Nature; by the Laws of our Country; and by the Study of propagating Religion. To this last we should yeild all, if the other two do not openly gain-say it. Where either the Law of Nature, or the Political Laws do command any thing, which is inconsistent with our Study of promoting Religion; we must diligently consider, what God commands us in that matter, that so we may exactly distinguish between his Will and our own; between what he requires, and what we are moved unto only by our own zeal. What God commands

X.

Paraphr.

in Psalm

Epist. De-

dic. 1662.

pag. 1.

*A Postscript.*

*a Discretionary  
Religious  
precept  
non adversum  
sum.*

mands is to be done, though our Parents  
or Magistrates command the contrary.  
But whatsoever is commanded by them,  
which is not contrary to the express Pre-  
cepts of Religion(a), that we are to look  
upon as commanded and given us  
in charge by God himself (because God  
is the Author of their Power, as he is the  
Author of Nature) whose Commands,  
and not our own voluntary Zeal, we are  
to make the Rule of our life. And there-  
fore we are not here to have more regard,  
either to the danger which we may fancy  
the Church is in, or to the hope which we  
have conceived to our selves of advancing the  
Glory of God, then to that Will of the most  
high God, which is manifested to us either  
in Nature, or in Civil Laws. For God  
hath affection enough to his own Glory,  
and kindness enough to his Church, and  
Power and Wisdom sufficient, notwith-  
standing all the dangers that I see, to ad-  
vance his Kingdom, and support his  
Church: although I contain my self  
within the bounds and limits which  
Nature and Civil Government pre-  
scribes.

This is the resolution of that excellent  
person, by whose Principles I wish heartily  
you

you would all govern your selves: otherwise the most glorious profession that you can make, will not perswade us you have the same spirit of Christian Piety. You have read perhaps, or heard how the Devil one day appeared to St. Martin, as he was at prayer; all glittering and shining in a most Majestick state: telling him that he was Christ, who being shortly to come down upon Earth, gave him a visit first. This he repeated again, faith the story, and bid him not be faithless, but believe. *So I Severus in will,* replied the good man, *but not till I see him in that habit and form wherein he suffered, bearing the Marks of his Cross.* *cap. 25.* The Application is easie; and in short but this. If you would be acknowledged for the faithful Disciple of the Lord Jesus, let us see you in that garb wherein they alway appeared; taking up the Cross patiently, humbly and lowly, meek and gentle, quiet and peaceable; submissive to Government, and obedient to Laws: Till then, we suspend our belief. Farewel.

---

F I N I S.



*Books printed for Henry Everſ-  
den, under the Crown-Ta-  
vern in Weſt-Smithfield.*

**T**He Divine Hiſtory of the *Genesis* of  
the World, explicated and illuſtrated;  
or a Philoſophical Comment on the firſt  
Chapter of *Genesis*, and tryal of Philoſophy  
both Ancient and Modern by that moſt  
infallible Rule. *Anonymus*, in quarto.

2. Πνεῦμα τὸ Προμηναιῖν : Or, a Being  
filled with the Spirit : As alſo the Divinity  
or God-head of the Holy Ghoſt aſſerted,  
and the Arguments brought againſt it  
thoroughly examined and answered, &c. By  
*John Goodwin* late of *Coleman-ſtreet*, *Lon-  
don*, quarto.

3. *Theodulia* : Or, a Juſt defence of Hear-  
ing the Sermons and other teaching of  
the preſent Miniſters of *England* : By *John  
Tombeſ* B.D.

4. A ſerious examination of the *Inde-  
pendants Catechiſm*, and therein of the chief  
Prin-

*Books sold by Henry Eversden.*

Principles of Nonconformity to, and separation from the Church of *England*, in two Parts. To which is added, an Appendix of the Authority of Kings, and obedience of Subjects: By *Benj. Camfield*, Rector of *Whitwell* in *Derbyshire*.

5. *The Pen's Dexterity Compleated*; Or *Mr. Rich's Short-hand* perfectly taught, which in his life-time was never done by any thing in Print: Allowed by both Universities *Oxford* and *Cambridge*.

---

**F I N I S.**

---